

# HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XVII

APRIL, 1924

NUMBER 2

## WAS THE BOOK OF ACTS A POSTHUMOUS EDITION?

J. DE ZWAAN

UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN

THE problem of the genesis of Acts involves various questions so intimately connected that they can scarcely be considered separately. Definite judgments are necessary on the distance between Acts and its sources, on the methods of the author compared with those of a modern historian, on the dates respectively of the composition of the book and of the events themselves, and, especially, on the difference between the author's portrait of the Apostle Paul, its background and setting, and the real Paul as disclosed by his own letters.

These judgments are dissimilar, each having its own structural nature. Those formed under the influence of tradition render a service by keeping alive the sense of the unknown. A sound conservatism will always emphasize the fact that life was as complicated in those early days as it is now, and that our evidence is fragmentary and far from complete. Those formed under the sway of nineteenth-century philosophy emphasize the fact that history is essentially a matter of great lines; not all the points need to be known in order to draw a line. They also rest in part on the coincidence of such lines with a groundplan. Things do not happen at random. History has a certain rational structure of its own, and we may be more or less confident — the actual degree depending upon our philosophical boldness — in trusting our insight respecting this structure as a means for recovering the past. Next come the professedly "philological" theories. They are compelled to take account of the facts of language and style, the question of literary dependence being primary. Such extreme views, for instance, as those of Van Manen and Steck meet here with

theories which in other respects resemble them as little as Harnack's and Torrey's. Finally, the comparative study of the religions of the Empire — especially that of the mystery-religions and of eschatological Judaism — makes its influence felt.

It is this complexity of factors which explains the varying hypotheses of writers on the sources of Acts. In the main they may be divided into two groups: — those who like Harnack, Torrey, and Jackson and Lake believe in sources, worked over by the author of Acts, and those who like Norden, Loisy, and Goguel, hold to an original composition, spoiled by the enterprise of an interpolator.

The purpose of the present article is to put forward a theory somewhat different from that of either of these two groups, and to suggest that Acts was edited, somewhat as Jackson and Lake suppose, by a post-pauline Christian (rather than, as Harnack or Torrey thinks, by Luke the companion of Paul), but that this edition was based on the unfinished writings of Luke, the author of the gospel, who had collected and partially arranged a variety of material drawn from various sources, including a diary of his own experiences, but had never finished his work. Thus according to this theory the final editor of Acts was not the author of the gospel — he corresponds more closely to Loisy's "interpolator," but his work was much less far-reaching than Loisy would claim.

## I

### *Recent Theories*

The most typical recent views on the genesis of Acts are those of Harnack,<sup>1</sup> Loisy,<sup>2</sup> and Goguel,<sup>3</sup> representing respectively a conservative, a radical, and a moderate solution of the problem.

According to Harnack our Acts was written by Luke the

<sup>1</sup> Adolf von Harnack, *Lukas der Arzt der Verfasser des dritten Evangeliums und der Apostelgeschichte*, 1906; *Die Apostelgeschichte, Untersuchungen*, 1908; *Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte und zur Abfassungszeit der synoptischen Evangelien*, 1911.

<sup>2</sup> Alfred Loisy, *Les Actes des Apôtres*, 1920.

<sup>3</sup> Maurice Goguel, *Introduction au Nouveau Testament*, tome III, *Le livre des Actes*, 1922.



companion of Paul. He conceived it and wrote it down almost in the form in which we have it, utilizing sources of varying quality and drawing information with little discrimination from various quarters. Harnack considers the language and style of the we-sections, when compared with the remainder of the Lucan writings, as proof of the identity of Luke with the 'Auctor ad Theophilum.'

Loisy maintains this same identity, but thinks that our Acts is by no means the original work of the historical Luke. That work, of which only a few fragments are preserved in our Acts, was history in the full sense of the word. It has, however, been edited into a "formless, legendary narrative." Little of it has escaped "the abominable sabotage" which, in our text, makes him "say the expedient in lieu of the truth." Surely, Luke himself "has not foreseen that he would become the victim" of "the spirit that dominated the Roman community from the end of the first century."

Goguel's is a more complicated theory. According to him the 'Auctor ad Theophilum' is not identical with Luke, but has utilized the work of Luke along with other sources, abridging it, often with some misunderstanding and awkwardness, and combining it with traditions of doubtful quality. Moreover, an interpolator has clumsily abridged the original Preface in order to insert the narrative of the Ascension. This same interpolator, or another hand, may be responsible for other narratives. Goguel thinks it an attractive hypothesis to ascribe to this hand the A-narratives of the first half of Acts, in which the miraculous element is more prominent, and seems to consider these as "secondary" doublets of the source which Harnack calls B. Yet he himself (p. 353) draws attention to the difficulties of such a position, which would imply "a more complicated genesis for I Acts than would be probable." Outside the we-sections it is often not clear which parts of Acts remain the work of Luke on Goguel's hypothesis. There seems scarcely a chapter on which doubt is not thrown and which in several verses does not have to suffer excision, rearrangement of contents, reinterpretation, and correction. Comparing Goguel with Loisy one gains the same impression as in reading the treatises in

which radical and moderate critics of the Tübingen school questioned each other's results. Often Goguel's criticism of Loisy seems fully justifiable, yet in the end an impression of confusion remains. Perhaps the volume of his New Testament Introduction on Paul, which will be based largely on the results of his Acts, will give a synthesis, clearing up much that now seems arbitrary; at present one feels the author to be moving in a circle as often as is the case with Loisy. On the historical value of Acts Goguel thinks it impossible to pronounce an unqualified judgment. The book contains materials which are unique, and which, though not of the same value as the Pauline epistles, make it possible to put the latter into their proper setting. Such materials are derived from an account of the missionary work of Paul written by one of his companions, who had informed himself at the best sources for the occasions at which he had not been present. The later 'Auctor ad Theophilum' has not infused his own theology into the book; on the contrary he has often faithfully represented ideas which ran counter to it. The great struggle for universalism in which Paul was the principal actor is for him a thing of the past. Yet the christology, especially of the speeches in I Acts, often corresponds to a stage anterior to Paul. Even the redactor has not occupied himself in effacing these theological and ecclesiastical archaisms, by means of which we are able to discern older strata among the documents which entered into the composition of our Acts.

According to Goguel the 'Auctor ad Theophilum' composed his work between about 80 and 90 A.D. His aim was to represent Christianity as a *religio licita*, a variant of Judaism and a continuation of prophetic religion. At the same time, however, he desires to show how Christianity as a universal religion came to the capital of the world. Goguel admits the hypothesis of a third book containing the trial and defence of Paul, perhaps also the events preceding his death. It was planned, not written, either by Luke or by the 'Auctor ad Theophilum.'

In my opinion none of these theories is satisfactory, and the evidence seems rather to support the hypothesis that our Acts



is a sketch left unfinished by Luke and afterwards edited by some friend or friends. He left it, as it appears, roughly outlined in his preface, which was not yet mutilated, — a skeleton-history filled in with extracts and notes in various states of redaction, some gaps being left, and the whole by no means ready for the scriptorium. The last part of it, if outlined at all, was dropped by the editors, who had to mutilate the preface accordingly. At first they probably went out of their way to emphasize what may be termed the 'apostolic' theory of their day. It is possible that the colorless nature of the eschatology of our Acts may be somehow due to their interference, but they left untouched much of the archaic character of its theology, and did not correct its unevenness, and its, for their time, undesirable incompleteness of information, which could so easily have been supplemented by edifying fiction. They did not do much even to bring the speeches — so important in the judgment of their contemporaries — up to the current standard of thought, nor did they smooth away the inequalities of the style. On the whole their treatment of Luke's work was conservative.

The species to which this hypothesis will be reckoned is not popular. Yet *abusus non tollit usum*. We know that Luke was not an easy composer. It is evident from his Gospel that he took much pains over details even of arrangement and wording. There is a probability, therefore, that Acts was prepared in the same somewhat laborious way, all the more that the materials were for a large part unorganized. Acts was a new venture. A plan had to be sketched out, and — the subject being novel and outside the beaten track of missionary instruction — the claims of the contemporary methods of writing history must have had greater weight with the author. There is nothing unlikely in the idea that such a work was left in an unsatisfactory state. Church history is perhaps the most difficult history to write, and Luke was the pioneer in this field.

With regard to the supposed editors, I should like to emphasize a few remarks of Windisch in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. II, p. 314, "A later comer . . . would certainly have sought diligently for sources of information, . . . would probably have discovered the Epistles and would have made

every effort to profit by them to the greatest possible extent," especially in the composition of his speeches. With Windisch I also deem "untenable" the Tübingen theory "that a special purpose, of furthering the plans of a definite party, controlled the pen of the author, and led him to revise what he knew to be a reliable tradition. We may find traces of a special purpose in the circumstance that the author has suppressed all sorts of unpleasant matter—only it is now no longer possible to prove what he knew but kept silent about" (p. 348). This problem of the neglect of Paul's writings becomes the more mysterious the nearer we approach a date at which these epistles had become public property. It points either to an early date for Acts or to a date at which it was still possible to oppose another Paul against the Paul of the epistles without explicitly controverting their testimony. It is quite fair to the testimony of Acts to suppose that its editors meant to serve—among other things—the memory of Paul by balancing his one-sided self-revelations in the fragmentary remains of his correspondence by another likeness more true to the impression which the Apostle had made on his faithful followers. As Emmet observes (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. II, p. 278) "it becomes increasingly clear that it is a mistake to regard Paul as the founder of Hellenistic or even of Hellenic Christianity." Friendship and love or veneration for the memory of a great leader are more frequent and more powerful incentives to the writing of books and the editing of remains than anything else. Of course, Luke's papers were not edited as disinterestedly as, for instance, the Oxyrhynchus papyri have been in our time. They were handled by one or more members of the nascent church, who must have been conscious of serving the interests of Christianity. Yet to start with diffidence as a principle would not be fair to the case. For it is evident that it cannot present itself fairly except to a mind that is on its guard against all "tradition." The tradition of criticism is equal to that of the churchmen in its subtle power to interfere with sound discrimination. In our case it has a tendency to take insufficient notice of the fact that our information about the rise of Christianity in the first century is not abundant. Nor are we too well acquainted with the spiritual map of that age, even in Palestine.



Caution is suggested, for example, by a study of the rising of Behaism out of the doctrines of the Bâb, and the difficulties meeting us there in the full light of the nineteenth century and among men with whom it is possible to become personally acquainted. So, admitting that the Paul of Geneva and Wittenberg is as little to be set up as a standard as the Paul of Rome or Constantinople, caution is also requisite with regard to what Western research has elicited from Paul's fragmentary and polemical remains. Romans is a great letter, but it is mainly an answer to Judaism. Where is Paul's answer to non-jewish monotheism and to the theories and practices by means of which popular philosophy and religion offered "salvation"? Salvation by faith is the central doctrine in most of our theories of Paulinism. Yet this is evidently a question of means, and the method of acquiring the summum bonum cannot have been central to a theory about God and his dealings with this world. If Paul ever thought out his message after the dialectic fashion of the theologians of his age, or even moved in that direction, his central doctrine may well have been some kind of *μῦθος* containing strong eschatological and cosmic elements. And much of this would have been common property, or at least fairly acceptable, to the masses who lingered about the synagogue. Finally, the question of the character of Paul requires some acquaintance with Eastern people. To deal fairly and honorably with them, a European, even at present, cannot adhere to his Nordic standards.

## II

### *The Plan of Acts*

For our theory the plan of Acts is not a minor question but one of primary importance. Of course the statement that Acts is arranged in a series of "panels" is incontrovertible, but it may be allowable to doubt the assertion that this was intended by the editors (Beginnings, vol. II, p. 177), and also to question Turner's interpretation of the "summaries" found in 6, 7; 9, 31; 12, 24; 16, 5; 19, 20; 28, 31, as marking an original six-floor structure of Acts.



The reader will indeed already have observed that 2, 47, "And the Lord added to them day by day those that were being saved," and 11, 21, "And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number that believed turned unto the Lord," are omitted by Turner. Moreover, we might add 11, 24, "and much people was added unto the Lord."<sup>3a</sup> No doubt the harmony of the scheme is disturbed by these additions, but far more important is the fact that on a comparison of analogous summaries in the Gospel it even appears doubtful that such phrases were ever meant to mark stages in the progress of the narrative. In the Gospel two parallel lines of such signpost-phrases can be distinguished, referring (*a*) mainly to incidents in the life of Jesus, and (*b*) to the feelings of the multitude. This last series reminds one in a remote way of the function of the chorus in Greek tragedy. But in several places the two strands are interwoven:

Luke

- 4, 14 (*a*) And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee: (*b*) and a fame went out concerning him through all the region round about.
- 4, 15 (*a*) And he taught in their synagogues, (*b*) being glorified of all.
- 5, 15 f. (*b*) But so much the more went abroad the report concerning him: and great multitudes came together to hear, and to be healed of their infirmities. (*a*) But he withdrew himself in the deserts, and prayed.
- 21, 37 f. (*a*) And every day he was teaching in the temple; and every night he went out, and lodged in the mount that is called the mount of Olives. (*b*) And all the people came early in the morning to him in the temple to hear him.
- 24, 36 (*a*) And as they spake these things, he himself stood in the midst of them. . . . (*b*) But they were terrified and affrighted.

The presentation of some cases of (*a*) and (*b*) in parallel columns, will show still more clearly the similarity of the two groups.

<sup>3a</sup> On Acts 5, 14, "And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women," see below. Interweaving is also observable in Acts.



(a) Jesus or John.

Luke

- 1, 80 And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, etc.
- 2, 40 And the child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom, etc.
- 2, 52 And Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, etc.
- 4, 44 And he was preaching in the synagogues of Galilee.
- 7, 1 After he had ended all his sayings in the ears of the people, he entered into Capernaum.
- 8, 1 And it came to pass soon afterwards, that he went about through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God.
- 9, 51 And it came to pass, when the days were well-nigh come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem.
- 11, 53 f. And when he was come out from thence, the scribes and the Pharisees began to press upon him . . . to catch something out of his mouth.
- 19, 48 And he was teaching daily in the temple. But the chief priests and the scribes, etc.
- 24, 52 f. And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy; and were continually in the temple, blessing God.

(b) The multitudes.

Luke

- 1, 65 And fear came on all that dwelt round about them: and all these sayings were noised abroad throughout all the hill country of Judaea.
- 2, 18 And all that heard it wondered at the things which were spoken unto them by the shepherds, etc.
- 4, 22 And all bare him witness, and wondered at the words of grace, etc.
- 4, 32 And he was teaching them on the sabbath day: and they were astonished at his teaching, etc.
- 4, 36 f. And amazement came upon all. . . . And there went forth a rumor concerning him into every place of the region round about.
- 7, 17 And this report went forth concerning him in the whole of Judaea, and all the region round about.
- 9, 43 And they were all astonished at the majesty of God. But while all were marvelling at all the things which he did, he said unto his disciples, etc.
- 13, 17 And all the multitude rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him.
- 23, 48 And all the multitudes that came together to this sight, when they beheld the things that were done, returned smiting their breasts.

Considering the contexts I should prefer in most cases to call these phrases 'stops' rather than 'summaries,' for neither in Acts nor in the Gospel do they really summarize the preceding narrative, and it is evident that the cases in Acts belong in the same class with those in the Gospel, especially those of the

*b*-type, the difference, such as it is, being due to the different subject-matter.

In Acts these summaries ought to recur at the natural end of pericopes. This, however, is not the case. One of the clear divisions in Acts, the famous *οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες*, repeated from 8, 4, occurs at 11, 19, starting of course a new subject. Yet, at 11, 21 we meet a summary, and at 11, 24 a second. At 15, 36 a new start is made with the introduction of Paul's career as an independent missionary. The summary does not occur until the middle of this introduction at 16, 5.

Furthermore, these summaries are not so rare in Acts, nor so clearly distinct from other phrases describing missionary success, as Turner's theory would demand. The whole situation is similar to that in the Gospel. Even the interweavings are not absent. In Acts it is no longer Jesus but the Christians, or the missionaries, that give the *a*-cases, and it is either "the multitude" or "the Jews" who come in for the *b*-cases, either with "amazement" or with hostility. Consider first a few interweavings:

Acts

- 2, 42 f. (a) And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers. (b) And fear came upon every soul: and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles.
- 5, 11-14 (a) And great fear came upon the whole church, (b) and upon all that heard these things. (a) And by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people; and they were all of one accord in Solomon's porch. (b) But of the rest durst no man join himself to them: howbeit the people magnified them; (a) and believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women.
- 19, 17-20 (b) And this became known to all, both Jews and Greeks, that dwelt at Ephesus; and fear fell upon them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified. Many also of them that believed came. . . . (a) So mightily grew the word of the Lord and prevailed.

The following are clear *b*-cases:

Acts

- 2, 12 And they were all amazed, and were perplexed, saying one to another, What meaneth this?
- 13, 12 Then the proconsul, when he saw what was done, believed, being astonished at the teaching of the Lord.



With these compare, "They were cut to the heart," in 2, 37; 4, 23; 7, 54; and note the motif of hostility in 4, 1 f.; 5, 17 f.; 17, 5; 17, 13. These cases of hostility running parallel with similar behavior of the scribes and Pharisees in the Gospel, are introduced and expressed in a very similar way.

The *a*-cases are, perhaps, still more striking, and show how much the use of such joints and stops is characteristic of Luke's style and methods. Notice the following:

Acts

- 1, 14 These all with one accord continued stedfastly in prayer.
- 2, 42 And they continued stedfastly, etc. (see above).
- \*2, 47 And the Lord added to them, etc. (see above).
- 4, 33 And with great power gave the apostles their witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus: and great grace was upon them all.
- \*5, 14 And believers were the more added to the Lord, etc. (see above).
- 6, 1 Now in these days, when the number of the disciples was multiplying.
- 6, 7 And the word of God increased . . . and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith (see above).
- 9, 31 So the church throughout all Judaea and Galilee and Samaria had peace, . . . and . . . was multiplied (see above).
- \*9, 42 And it became known throughout all Joppa: and many believed on the Lord.
- \*11, 21 (see above).
- \*11, 24 (see above).
- 12, 24 But the word of God grew and multiplied (see above).
- \*13, 48 f. And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed. And the word of the Lord was spread abroad throughout all the region.
- 14, 21 And when they had preached the gospel to that city, and had made many disciples.
- 15, 41 And he went through Syria and Cilicia confirming the churches.
- 16, 5 So the churches were strengthened in the faith, and increased in number daily (see above).
- 17, 4 And of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few.
- 17, 12 Many of them therefore believed; also of the Greek women of honorable estate, and of men, not a few.
- 18, 8 And many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized.
- 19, 10 f. So that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks. And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul.
- 19, 20 So mightily grew the word of the Lord (see above).

With chapter xix the missionary work of Paul, to whom the author is now confining his attention, is over, and he has consequently until the very end no further occasion to use these

general phrases to sum up or to suggest things which he could have told.<sup>4</sup> Thus to the six instances mentioned by Turner at least six others must be added (marked by asterisks above). Some of Turner's six do not indeed sit so loosely in their context, but, adding the other cases, and comparing the rest, there appears to be a shading off from those which convey definite information to such as give mere generalities, and this shading off is gradual. Accordingly, as in the Gospel, it seems inadvisable to regard these phrases as keystones in Luke's edifice. The author undeniably cares for a sort of rhythm in his narrative, and undoubtedly Acts is divided into a series of "panels," but these latter are numerous, are not of equal length, and do not include the whole contents of the book.

To grasp the plan of Acts we must study its contents and observe the fundamental changes of scene. The true conclusion appears to be that Acts is a pyramid. At first (1, 1-11, 18) the scene is *Palestine*, the sphere of action of the Jerusalem Christians. Next comes *Antioch* (11, 19-15, 35), the cradle of gentile Christianity and of the mission to the gentiles. Finally (15, 36-28, 31) *Paul*, the missionary to the gentiles *par excellence*, occupies the whole stage. Seen from the author's point of view as a collector of information, this is natural, and was necessarily a gradually narrowing scheme: first a country, then a city, finally the activity of one great man.

The arguments for a "third book" do not seem to me as precarious as to Windisch (*Beginnings*, vol. II, p. 311), but it is unnecessary to repeat what Ramsay, Zahn, Goguel, and others have written on this subject. I should only like to add, that a pyramid ought to have a gilt top; Acts has not. It ends with one of the summaries 28, 30 f., "And he abode two whole years (διετίαν ὅλην) in his own hired dwelling, and received all that went in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness, none forbidding him (μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἀκωλύτως)." This is no fit ending for a book built like Acts. It is especially no fit ending for the last chapter. The last verse before the final paragraph, 28, 28, has still the sound of a program: "Be it

<sup>4</sup> For 28, 30 f., see below; so also for 18, 23 στηρίζων πάντας τοὺς ἀδελφούς.



known therefore unto you, that this salvation of God is sent unto the gentiles: they will also hear (αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούσονται).” In these words is a sound of victory, a forward-looking confidence, making a sharp contrast with the subdued pianissimo of the last lines of the book. The allusions to the trial of Paul at Rome are invariably favorable (cf. 24, 27), and the technical term *διετία* may imply that Paul was set free. Yet the author seems to write after Paul’s death (cf. 20, 24–38). Therefore, especially seeing that in a carefully worded preface the distinction between *πρότερος* and *πρῶτος* cannot be easily slurred over, it is worth while to inquire more closely whether Acts does not imply a more comprehensive plan than was executed, or at least more than has been incorporated into our Acts.

It has been very ably argued by W. Mundle in the *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1923, pp. 20–42, that Paul favored an ecclesiasticism (*Kirchenbewusstsein*) of a more “Catholic” character than is usually conceded. It is a fact that Catholic Christianity is, after all, Pauline. Paul was accepted at Rome; and certainly Acts does not wish us to understand that this only took place many years after his death. Yet the summary at the end of Acts gives a blank of two years. Nothing is said of his relations to the Roman Christians after 28, 15, *κάκειθεν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἀκούσαντες τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν ἦλθαν εἰς ἀπάντησιν ἡμῖν ἄχρι Ἀππίου Φόρου καὶ Τριῶν Ταβερνῶν, οὓς ἰδὼν ὁ Παῦλος εὐχαριστήσας τῷ θεῷ ἔλαβε θάρσος*. It is but natural to suggest that during Paul’s stay at Rome the epistle to the Romans must have afforded the basis of a thorough discussion. But it is quite in the way of Luke’s methods to suppose that he had reserved this discussion to make it a *scène à faire*, to give it somewhere a central position in order to mark the final reconciliation of the principles of Paul with the practice of Peter. That reconciliation is foreshadowed in Acts xv. When the author drops Peter in that chapter, it is only after having emphasized his claims, and so prepared for the future. In fact the way in which our Acts leads up to Rome makes it necessary to suppose that a counterpart of Acts xv was in the plan for a final volume. Though our Acts is in one sense essentially a Jerusalem-volume, all the principal actors

looking towards that centre, yet it is no less clear that it more and more looks forward to Rome as the action proceeds. It is one half of an ellipse cut on a line which makes a sharp angle with the main axis. The Peter-line has been cut short, leaving Peter with the intention of becoming an apostle to the gentiles and with some justification for this intention. The Paul-line is prolonged much further, indeed up to the height of the second point of interest, Rome. The author is fully conscious of the importance which Peter had already obtained, and aims to show this by those studied parallelisms between the two great leaders which are obvious at the first reading of the narrative. Bringing Paul to Rome he has closed his career as an independent missionary, and in the text quoted above has been careful to note that Paul is now in the presence of Christian communities not founded by him. Our Acts as a Jerusalem-volume is planned with a view to a Roman volume.

I do not claim that the central chapter of that book — probably never written — was reserved for a personal agreement between Paul and Peter. But our Acts is following an upward slope towards a culmination. That culmination need not have been planned as a dramatic scene, but from the nature of what is left of Luke's work it is a safe guess that it would have told how — in Luke's eyes — the corner-stone was laid for the Catholic Christianity of his days.

Next in importance must have been the death of Paul, perhaps also that of other apostles, for surely the author must have intended to tell how Paul departed to be with Christ. We may infer this from the insistence on the details of Paul's successive trials so far as these fell within the limits of our Acts. It seems to me a mistake to view those details about the attitude of the Roman authorities merely as an attempt to influence Roman opinion. Rome ruled its subjects much in the way of an old-time chartered company, and its delegates behaved accordingly. We cannot compare the Roman official with those of our age, with its press, its public opinion, and its influential magazines. A very benevolent reader of Acts might be favorably impressed, but one need but read the very cautiously worded letter of Pliny to Trajan to see how unlikely is the suggestion that an



anonymous writing full of irrelevant and even detrimental contentions could ever have been meant to influence the dry matter-of-fact way in which Roman justice was administered. That Paul the Christian missionary was a Roman citizen, was a fact of some value, of course. That he was treated as a Roman, might have gone without saying. It had to be said, even at the cost of Jewish sensibilities, "because these Jews of Judaea opposed" (ἀντιλεγόντων δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἠναγκάσθη ἐπικαλέσασθαι Καίσαρα, οὐχ ὡς τοῦ ἔθνους μου ἔχων τι κατηγορεῖν, Acts 28, 19). The Neronian razzia among the Christians of Rome must also have come in somehow, but we know how very neatly Luke could summarize.

Considering the structure of our Acts, it is probable that, the ellipse once closed, Luke may have wished to handle his colors in such a way as to present a contrast of shades: men, city, world. The Neronian crisis would have furnished an exact counterpart to the persecution which led to the missionary work along the coast of Palestine, and οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες might return once more to pick up a broken thread (the case of Priscilla and Aquila).

Acts was not planned as a history of Paul. Neither was it meant to exalt Paul in a partisan way at the cost of other missionaries. It is the second volume of a larger work, intended to provide a certain *κράτιστος* named Theophilus with historical knowledge that would enable him to obtain *ἐπίγνωσις* concerning the *ἀσφάλεια* of the *λόγοι περὶ ὧν κατηχήθη*. Luke must have deemed it in the interest of Christianity to provide this "authority" with such knowledge: a book is not commonly dedicated to a man of no importance or of hostile mind. Nor is it easy to suppose that a man of experience, like this author, is pleading a partisan view on such an occasion. He would show reason, *μετρίότης*, in his *σύνθεσις τῶν ἐμφερομένων*. It would have been no compliment to Theophilus to connect his name with a work devoid of *μεγαλοφροσύνη*, when treating seriously a noble subject.

Similar reasons also may have caused the work to be left unfinished. Acts was a new venture, and a most difficult one. The nearer to his own time the author drew, the more uncertain he

must have felt. Moreover Acts is left unpolished. The Aramaic documents are not sufficiently worked over. Luke knows how to cover his track; here he has neglected to do so. The speech of Stephen is a mere draft. Would a competent author ever have left a speech in such a state? The same is true of the loose ends of the we-sections. These are glaring faults against the decencies of ancient style and technique,<sup>5</sup> which no author who respected his readers would have left uncorrected. The end of Acts is another case. Moreover it is a very lame ending, the ἀκωλύτως reminding the reader of a technical phrase in a lease.

The author of Acts knew his Greek too well and was too well acquainted with the ancient world, he plainly knew too well what he was about when he took in hand to write his book, his Gospel — the first volume — is too well finished, that we should lightly accuse him of having himself published a "treatise" so little finished according to the standards of his day as our Acts.

From the plan of Acts, however, it is sufficiently clear that the author had given much thought to the subject and knew what he wanted to do. And, as has already been shown by a comparison of the "summaries" in the second volume with those in the first, he is probably the same man who wrote the most literary and living of the four gospels. In Acts, however, we see him at his work, gradually compiling a whole, bringing in a touch here and there and leaving other things in the state of raw materials. But the skeleton intended to carry the whole structure is ready, as far as it was needed.

### III

#### *The Apostolic Decree*

In *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Emmet summarizes the case of Acts xv in a way to which I can give complete assent (vol. II, p. 297): "The most critical point is Acts xv, and even

<sup>5</sup> Goguel's opinion (p. 163) that Norden has "demonstrated" (*Agnostos Theos*, pp. 313 f.) that the we-sections "are of comparatively frequent occurrence in works which in literary character in some degree approach Acts," is guarded. In fact the parallels are disappointing, the approach to Acts being rather questionable. On the Flinders Petrie Papyri II, 45 and III, 144 (Wileken, *Chrestomathic*, no. 1) cf. A. G. Roos in *Mnemosyne*, LI, 1923, pp. 262-278.



here . . . there is a fair and reasonable solution of the difficulty, a solution not forced by any apologetic necessity, but suggested by Galatians itself." I also partly agree with his statement (p. 293) that the restrictive clauses of the Apostolic decree "are not to be interpreted as though they laid down a minimum of law necessary to salvation; this, indeed, Paul could never have acknowledged. They are rather the practical recognition of certain usages, very possibly usages which already existed, intended to facilitate intercourse between the two sections of the Church." It is to the last part of this statement that I must demur, for I cannot give entire assent to the assertion that the object of the clauses was "to facilitate intercourse" between gentile and Jewish Christians. It is quite true that at Corinth "there was no controversy as to circumcision," and that "the regulation about *εἰδωλόθυτα* is not really relevant, since the point at issue was the relation between gentile Christians and their heathen neighbours" (p. 274), yet Emmet concedes on the same page that the Corinthian church was only "predominantly gentile," and here is the fissure into which the Editors (p. 154) and Windisch (pp. 326 f.) can drive the point of their objections; nor can I see how these can be met unless it can be shown why the decree had to be — not partly but as a whole — a local and temporary thing.

This can, however, be shown by paying attention to the plan of Acts, in which the decree forms the climax of a series of events, and in which the clue to its interpretation is furnished by the use made of it later on.

The key to the question is the fact that in the East religion is nationality. It was largely so in the Roman Empire. National religions were 'lawful' religions, and the line of defence followed by Acts is in many cases simply to maintain that Christianity is — notwithstanding the opposition of the officials of Judaism at Jerusalem — a variant of the Jewish religion. The God of the Jews is the God whom the Christians adore. The *Χριστός* of the Jews is Jesus. Christians of the type represented by the author of Acts would not have been displeased if Roman authorities had followed the precedent of Gallio, who without further enquiry into the case took it at its face-value

and decided (18, 15): εἰ δὲ ζητήματά ἐστιν περὶ λόγου καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς, ὄψεσθε αὐτοί· κριτὴς ἐγὼ τούτων οὐ βούλομαι εἶναι, thus implying the essentially Israelite nature of Christianity.

Paul was living at a time when such a decision was still a possibility. The decree falls at a still earlier date, and — what is significant — it is a decision taken at Jerusalem. The interests of the Jewish Christians in Palestine and in Jerusalem were greatly affected by it. From this point of view it should primarily be interpreted. *We are in the habit of putting the interests of the Pauline churches first in our considerations, but this is contrary to the testimony of Paul himself and also to that of Acts.* What interests the decree was believed to guard is evident from the context into which the footnote referring to it is inserted at 21, 25. That insertion is also significant in itself. It is meant to ease the relations between the Christians in Palestine and the not yet christianized part of the chosen people. And it was not the easing, but a definite ideal, which made the matter so vitally important. The “society” (αἵρεσις, 24, 5; 14; 28, 22) of the ἅγιοι, or the Ναζωραῖοι, was wrestling with the “society” of the *chaberim*, or the Φαρισαῖοι, for the soul of their people. Each offered a definite *derech*, a definite ‘way’ by which the ἐλπίς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ (28, 20) would be accomplished. They were in agreement upon the possibility of divine interference with the present world. Probably their general conceptions—seven heavens, paradise in the third heaven, archangels and their adversaries in these heavens, special predestination of great leaders and great adversaries, final salvation of a “chosen people”—were almost identical, except for the significant place reserved for Jesus. Part of this may be inferred from Josephus, who (Ant. xvii, 2, 3, drawing from Nicolaus of Damascus, historian of Herod the Great) estimates the membership of the organized Pharisees at 6000.

We may be sure that the ideal of this Christian “society” was not below that to which Paul gives expression in Romans 11, 26, πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται. But they greatly differed about the methods by which this should be brought about. For them it was a matter of primary importance not to become estranged

from the body of their nation. Acts itself emphasizes the fact that "priests, a great company of them" (6, 7), and even Pharisees (15, 5), had obtained membership, instead of joining the Sadducean and Pharisean bodies. Paul was quite conscious of this situation and of its importance for the prospects of Christianity in Judaea (cf. Acts xxiii and xxvi). The position of James, who could obtain the surname of "the *saddiq*," and perish as a martyr praying for the sins of his people (cf. Eus., H. E. ii, 23, 17 εὐχεται ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ὁ δίκαιος, and Josephus, Ant. xx, 9, 1), becomes comprehensible on this view.

Just as little as Israel could amalgamate itself with the nations, could a community which wished that through it *πᾶς Ἰσραήλ* should be saved identify itself with similar communities to which gentiles were indifferently admitted. The national element was inseparable from the religious, at least in Palestine. It was one of those hard facts which are stronger than principles. But what Israel allowed itself for the sake of its propaganda might be permissible also to the community of the ἄγιοι. The synagogue had a large fringe. It was not necessary to become a proselyte and to suffer circumcision in order to be allowed to "hear Moses" and to adore the God of Israel. Cornelius, and the centurion at Capernaum in Luke vii, are instances of such φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν. On the other hand one need but remember Horace, Sat. i, 9, 68 ff.:

memini bene; sed meliori  
tempore dicam: hodie tricesima sabbata: vin'tu  
curtis Judaeis oppedere? Nulla mihi, inquam,  
religio est — At mī: sum paulo infirmior, *unus*  
*multorum*. . . .

Now what the decree is inculcating is part of what afterwards were called the "Noachian ordinances," which even the Gentiles, according to rabbinic opinion, ought to keep. Though we are not well informed about the conditions on which friends of Horace were admitted to the synagogues, it is clear that 'impure' Gentiles could never be allowed to defile a place of religion. 'Impurity,' however, is mainly a question of contact with demons and the *fluidum* implanted by them on objects, places, and persons. Bacon's article in the Expositor, January, 1914,



pp. 40-61, cannot be repeated here, but it has settled the point that Acts xv contains a continuous group of regulations, all regarding ἀλίσγημα, to which in the LXX the verb ἀλίσγέω corresponds, with the same technical sense of contagious (supernatural) pollution.

The Apostolic decree, therefore, settled this point: we, Palestinian Christians, can only recognize as belonging to the church such communities as admit to membership those who are admissible to the synagogues in the dispersion and exclude those who are not.

Acts xv is not a compromise in the field of doctrine. Neither is it a compromise on usages facilitating intercourse between heathen and Jewish members of the church. It was a matter of practical church-policy, the recognition of a vital demand made by the circumstances in which the church in Palestine found itself if it was to realize its aspirations. If it had had to recognize neighboring Christian communities separated from the local bodies of Jews by the fact that they admitted persons who were refused entrance to the local synagogues, it would have reached a situation seriously endangering its ideal of becoming the rallying point for the true Israel. This is the heart of the matter, as appears also from the express mention in the rescript of those regions which are next-door: Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia. Even in the churches immediately beyond this sphere of influence, founded by Barnabas and Paul acting jointly as envoys of the Antiochian church, τὰ δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων are proclaimed by them. A still stronger illustration of the real urgency of the matter of the Jerusalem-Antioch agreement is to be found in the words διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους of 16, 3, which should be explained as 'on account of the difficulties of the brethren in Judaea.' Of course criticism from Cilicia and regions closer by would prove the most damaging, and would be most sure to come and most difficult to evade or silence. But it does not appear that even the outer sphere of Asia was abandoned, as it might have been, somewhat in the way that Galilee was spoken of as "Galilee of the Gentiles," a region in which a true Jew could not live and remain undefiled. It seems that Asia — in the second century the

home-land of Christianity — was viewed as a kind of reservation about which the orthodox in Judaea were sensitive. Of course, there were Jews in Asia passing for worshippers of Sabazios, but Paul himself was the son of Pharisees, and the influence of the Jews in those places is quite clear from the account which Acts gives of the persecutions which he had later to suffer there. It is at least significant that already in Acts 6, 9 we meet men ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας among the adversaries of Stephen. More significantly still, Paul is forbidden by the πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ to preach in the province of Asia (16, 7), and, finally, the accusations of Asian Jews lead to his destruction when he is back in Jerusalem (21, 27; 24, 18).

Moreover, we must observe that no real gentile had been admitted to the community of the ἄγιοι, for 11, 19, “to none but Jews” corrects 8, 4. The Samaritans in chapter viii are worshippers of Jehovah. Yet the responsibility of Philip, endorsed by Peter and John, is taken over by the Spirit (8, 17 ff.). Eunuchs could find admittance to the chosen race. Nevertheless an angel again confirms the admittance of the eunuch of Queen Candace to the community of the ἄγιοι. In this context we may be sure that 8, 40 does not imply preaching to people outside the pale of the synagogue. The same is true of Peter’s missionary success in the southern parts of the coast plain (9, 35, a summary); yet it is worth while to observe (vs. 43) that he “abode many days in Joppa with one Simon a tanner”: a very liberal course, tanners and tanners’ dwellings being unclean, so that Peter, according to the source which Luke is reproducing here, must have felt somewhat uneasy. According to rabbinic tradition breakfast-time for ordinary persons is the fourth, for laborers the fifth, but for the “learned” the sixth hour (11.40 A.M.—12.20 P.M., varying with the time of the year). Peter took his meal at the sixth hour: he took it separately at the hour of the “learned,” and it was specially prepared for him. One need not wonder, therefore, that the vision instructed him on uncleanness! And the first significant consequence of it is that he now takes his meal with the strangers, εἰσκαλεσάμενος οὖν αὐτοὺς ἐξένισεν. The repetition of the history (especially 10, 11–16; 11, 5–10) shows how important

this matter of clean and unclean was for the original Jewish narrator. It also shows that Luke had not yet found occasion to substitute for the clumsy Semitic method of emphasis by repetition a more Hellenic method of effecting the same result.

The top of the curve is reached in the case of Cornelius, his family and friends. The man himself was a Roman! Still worse, he was an officer of that foreign corps which in the maritime base on the coast had to keep an eye on the pious Jewish king, Herod Agrippa, who had begun to improve the walls of the Holy City. Yet Cornelius and his family are admitted, all of them being φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, that is, belonging to that fringe of no longer strictly unclean gentiles who were allowed to "hear Moses" and to worship the God of Israel. But angels, visions, and an effusion of the Spirit ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας τὸν λόγον emphasize the supreme importance of this crowning fact: at that early date the admission of mere φοβούμενοι was still a moot point for Jerusalem and its community of ἅγιοι. The point is not finally decided with the liberal exclamation (11, 18), ἄρα καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὁ θεὸς τὴν μετάνοιαν εἰς ζωὴν ἔδωκεν, for the ἔθνη of this story were made clean by God. By conceding so much, however, the original narrator did not commit himself to the theory that they were cleansed by faith, in the later Pauline sense of that phrase.

In Acts xv, however, that whole phrase is significantly ignored. In a similar way are treated the acquiescence of Barnabas as a Jerusalem delegate, and the results of the preaching of the "men from Cyprus and Cyrene" among the Greeks at Antioch, though Barnabas is said to have been not merely an ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός, but πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ πίστεως. Moreover, at the very beginning the initiative of the Cyprians and Cyrenians is contrasted with that of the other διασπαρέντες who "spoke the word to none, save only to Jews" (11, 19 f.).

But the beginning of the Antiochian mission is expressly marked by the initiative of the Spirit (13, 2 f.), Barnabas and Paul being the missionaries. Here again the great issue is cautiously approached; the Roman proconsul in Cyprus is already an ἀνὴρ συνετός, and it is not said that he became a Christian, for vs. 12, ἰδὼν τὸ γεγονός ἐπίστευσεν, is entirely balanced by



ἐκπλησσόμενος ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ κυρίου, which is not the same as ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον! The first sermon of Paul (13, 16-41), is duly addressed to the ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, but at last, in 13, 46, we find, covered by the joint authority of Barnabas and Paul, the clear enunciation of the early Antiochian practice: ὑμῖν [sc. τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις] ἀναγκαῖον ἦν πρῶτον λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐπειδὴ ἀπωθεῖσθε αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀξιὸς κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰώνιου ζωῆς, ἰδοὺ στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη.

Afterward, when the agreement between Jerusalem and Antioch is reached on the basis that these ἔθνη should be only such as were Cornelius and his friends who had sought admittance to Jewish worship (or were qualified to do so), Paul <sup>6</sup> and Silas, fully alive to the real kernel of the difficulties, carried it out even in South Galatia, conceding evidently that Derbe, Lystra, and the other towns might be reckoned to the Antiochian field. On this occasion the circumcision of Timothy by Paul brings out again how strongly the διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους — the practical interest of the Jerusalem community and of its vocation among the Jews of Palestine — underlies the whole transaction. *It was not a decision about principles, but about practical missionary policy.* The decree itself puts it as a question of μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι βάρος, and does not argue the reason of the ἐπάναγκες, assuming this as of course known. To feel the necessity of these four prohibitions it was, indeed, not necessary to be acquainted with texts like Gen. 9, 4; Lev. 3, 17; 7, 26; 17, 10-14; 18, 20; 19, 26; 1 Sam. 14, 33, or others. Ordinary public opinion was quite sufficient to carry the conviction that demoniac pollution must be contagious, and is incompatible with communion with a body of ἅγιοι. Now even Paul consistently calls the members of his churches ἅγιοι. Only in the epistle to the Galatian churches, who seemed to be turning to the στοιχεῖα, is the word absent.<sup>7</sup>

I cannot follow here the interpretation of the whole of Acts xv from this historical point of view. Yet there are one or two

<sup>6</sup> παραδοθεὶς τῇ χάριτι τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, a qualification which was not bestowed upon Barnabas and Mark by the Antiochian church on this occasion!

<sup>7</sup> See my *Handelingen der Apostelen*, Tekst en Uitleg, Wolters, Groningen, 1920, ad. loc., and my *Imperialisme van den Oudechristelijken Geest*, Erven Bohn, Haarlem, 1919, pp. 107-191.

points which cannot be passed in silence. The accepted tradition is that in Acts xv Peter is made to paulinize. I cannot see whence any of us have such intimate knowledge of Peter's convictions at this date, especially those who prefer to put Galatians some years after the Council. Loisy, to quote the latest writer, comments on the first verses of Acts xv as follows (p. 578): "It is simply not true that the Cornelius episode should have solved at Jerusalem the problem of the Gentiles before it offered itself. The problem had not presented itself on Palestinian soil, and the original Apostles had not had a thought of it before a mixed community was established at Antioch and similar communities founded in Syria and Cilicia by Hellenistic missionaries." "Certainly they did not possess any decision prepared beforehand and settled in advance. On the other hand, they were not ready for a course of non-interference with what was going on with respect to the propagation of the gospel among the Gentiles. The exigencies of the collection . . . are proof of a very remarkable interest on their side in uniting all Christian communities to Jerusalem as the centre of their faith. This interest, self-explained by the circumstances under which this faith arose, proceeds from a sentiment to which Paul kept a life-long fidelity. It was the generative principle of the church. This principle is the Jewish idea of a Divine Community. With the assent of these honest believers, and almost without their perceiving what was happening, this principle was about to constitute the church of the Christ outside of Judaism."

There is much truth in this, but it will soon appear how fatal it is to define "the problem of the Gentiles" without taking into account the facts to which attention was drawn above. We are told by Loisy (p. 580), with reference to the speech of Peter at the Council, that "Peter speaks as do the epistles to the Galatians and Romans. He is only at one remove from being made to profess that the law is not obligatory for converted Jews. . . . But it is not by a simple anachronism (Preuschen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 94) that the redactor . . . is lending to Peter the language of Paul. It is his intention to make it appear that the principle proclaimed by Paul and

in his days accepted by the church had from the first been promulgated by Peter. This fictitious discourse and the fictitious history of Cornelius have the same meaning and are due to the same motives. It is very significant that the Paul of Acts is never found speaking as he taught, and that the only time that this doctrine occurs, it is on the lips of Peter and on an occasion where Paul, with Barnabas, would have had to make his own thoughts prevail. Peter has verily become the prince of the apostles, the founder of the Christian tradition and the foundation of the church."

This all looks very much like interpretation founded on secret knowledge. Against the reconstruction of early Christian history which lies behind these assertions, I have already brought forward some objections based on considerations of method, but it is not superfluous to consider once more what is the case in our text of Acts. Religion and nationality are one. That is the historical fact from which the practical difficulties proceed. Jewish religion and Jewish nationality are one in the covenant between God and his chosen people. Later on we see Paul defining this covenant as the covenant of God with Abraham. Abraham was not circumcised, and therefore according to Paul uncircumcised membership in the church, in the community of the *σωζόμενοι*, had divine warrant. Pharisaic Christians, however, defined the covenant as the covenant with Moses. Circumcision in that case becomes a *conditio sine qua non*. Definite acceptance of Israelite nationality was, however, consequent on this: one could not be an adorer of the God of the Jews, and in addition accept circumcision, without becoming legally a Jew. Before Hadrian circumcision was not punished, but one may suspect that it had consequences for the legal status of a person in Roman and other courts. One could obtain Roman citizenship overruling but not extinguishing original citizenship of some native state. Probably a native could desire Jewish nationality and thereby the Jewish status, if in his town the *πολίτευμα* of the Jews enjoyed a privileged status. But could a Roman citizen assume Jewish nationality without a sort of *capitis diminutio*? These Pharisaic Christians were fighting for a very Palestinian and limited point of view, and did not take



into account the real difficulties in the larger world. We have suggested above the valid reasons they had for this narrowness. The definition of the limits of the covenant — for practical reasons necessary — was also inevitably a question of defining the limits of religious nationality as seen by the majority of Palestinian and Jerusalem Jews. And this last point was vital. If on this decisive point the community of the ἄγιοι took a decision which would be untenable before public opinion in Palestine, it would make itself impossible and block the future of its ideal, for the renascence of Palestinian-Jewish chauvinism which — with Roman lack of understanding and tact as a secondary cause — led to the great war was already making itself felt.

Given these circumstances, there is nothing incredible in Peter's opposing the Pharisaic positions. When he claims that neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear the yoke, he does not flatly say that it is the yoke of the law. It is the Pharisaic word 'yoke' which he is using, and it is the Pharisaic measure and weight of that yoke at which, in this context, he must be aiming. An orthodox Jew, not being a Pharisee, could quite well use such language. Even orthodox Jews expected salvation by a grace which would make up for their deficit by the merits of the fathers, the prophets, and other saints, or even by simple grace, always extended to the repentant. The Christian element in Peter's speech is that this grace is that of the Lord Jesus. The weakness of the speech lies either in its failure to deny that the law could have anything to do with salvation or, the law being necessary, in its omission to define for whom and to what extent the law remained obligatory. With the words (vs. 11), *καθ' ὃν τρόπον κἀκεῖνοι*, this defect is not remedied, for the *ἐκεῖνοι* were not all, perhaps not more than an insignificant minority, real gentiles before their conversion. But Peter is represented as shunning the issue. He does not raise the question which was implied in the mention of circumcision by the Pharisaic Christians, and made actual by the fact that the limits of the covenant were under discussion, namely, whether an external operation suffered on the eighth day of its life by a child unconscious of what was happening, could be decisive for

the limits to which God's saving grace (taken eschatologically, of course) should extend itself. But this question, so put, is from a modern point of view. Paul came near to it, but afterwards. We do not know whether at that date and that occasion he would have put it so sharply and definitely. The real issue which in all probability Peter could very well have raised, and which was perfectly familiar to him as an Oriental Jew, living among the Levantines of the first century, was the question of clean and unclean. Israelites are clean, being circumcised. Gentiles, not being circumcised, are unclean. Only the clean have access to the God of Israel and will be saved.

In these terms of Oriental belief the question of religious nationality — which was the vital issue — presented itself as the mightiest of popular motives. We ought not to forget that the distinctions between bodily and ritual cleanness, between cleanness and holiness, between holiness and ethical sanctity, were only beginning to be developed. They are certainly not distinctions understood by the masses, and even now they are not yet common property in the East. In fact only Protestants, as a whole, are quite sure of themselves on these points. The force of the argument of Peter, as would be expected, lies in these beliefs. The members about whose admission dispute had arisen could not be considered unclean, for God himself has poured out his 'holy' Spirit upon them. It is inconceivable that τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον should be in the same place as the contagion of some ἀλίσγημα.

In after years, when St. Paul has to confront the question of demoniac contagion in connection with Greek club-life, which made the eating of meat offered to the idols almost a necessity if one would not altogether cut himself and his family loose from his social surroundings, the case is wholly different. Gentile Christians did not care much for the interests of the Jerusalem community; it is only Paul, who is soon going to Jerusalem, who realizes the situation and with all his might promotes the benefaction. The decree itself he nowhere invokes. It could be taken as not valid for regions beyond the Antiochian mission-field, or beyond Asia Minor, as antiquated because the hope of winning πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ in the way once ex-

pected had proved vain, or invalid because of the evidence of the *πνεῦμα*. Yet there is an uneasiness in Paul's words on this point. He himself seems to have conquered the fear of *ἀλισγήματα*, and he could say (1 Cor. 7, 40), *δοκῶ δὲ καὶ γὰρ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν*. But the question remained a practical one, in the presence of hard facts, and required statesmanship. The fundamental principle of separation from the unclean — the principle of uncleanness being left unanalysed — is by no means abandoned, not even by him (cf. 2 Cor. 6, 15 ff.), *τίς μερίς πιστῶ μετὰ ἀπίστου; τίς δὲ συγκατάθεσις ναῶ θεοῦ μετὰ εἰδώλων; ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἐσμεν ζῶντος . . .* (7, 1 ff.) *ταύτας οὖν ἔχοντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀγαπητοί, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἀγιωσύνην ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ*. The spaced expressions are very significant, and it is questionable whether the interpretation of the Protestant pulpit does justice to their meaning in the early Levantine world.

I do not see that much is gained by making Paul not present at the time of the decree. Even if we could conclude from Acts 21, 25 that this was the case (to my view not a safe conclusion), Paul must have known about it when writing to the Corinthians. And if the nature of the decree had been such as is assumed by the traditional Tübingen view, he would certainly have been so deeply interested in it that he could not have failed to know the actual text.

Peter's speech, therefore, is certainly not Pauline in the sense of our theories of Paulinism, and it would be a mistake to explain the words *τῇ πίστει καθάρσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν* as Pauline in this sense, everything, of course, depending on the contents of this *πίστις*. It is begging the question to make the term simply stand for the 'faith' of present-day paulinizing Protestantism. At all events it would have to be explained in present-day terms how that 'faith' can possibly 'make clean' in the ancient sense of the word, which implied so much that is entirely strange to us. In the context of Acts, however, as it stands, this is not our task. This task, moreover, cannot be accomplished by emphasizing the phrase *τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν*. For the relation between the *καρδία* and the 'power' of Sin is not that of the pulpit. It is the *πνεῦμα* — which is not something



like the victory of pious impulses over wrong ones, but a real, almost material, entity — which drives out the powers of darkness. And these ‘powers’ were not conceived by the ancients in a merely figurative way. Exactly what is meant by *καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν* is hardly expressible in our habitual categories, and it is not easy to reach certain conclusions on such points. But to decide upon the Pauline or Petrine character of the concepts which once were alive in these words is hazardous.

Nor is the speech of James (15, 14–21) Pauline. Attention should, however, be given to its last line, which again clearly shows the *practical* background of the discussion. Under the current interpretation there is no logical connection between 5, 21 and the preceding discussion. Yet evidently these words are of supreme importance for the point James is making. *Μωσῆς γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρύσσοντας αὐτὸν ἔχει ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος* is a sentence which does not further the discussion unless this *ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων* is emphasizing a well-known ancient usage inside and outside Palestine which is of utmost importance for the issues under discussion. The reference is in the *κηρύσσειν* and in the hearers to whom these synagogue readings of the Old Testament were known to bring a *κήρυγμα*. These are the ‘demi-proselytes,’ as Juster calls them in his “*Les Juifs dans l’Empire romain.*” The New Testament calls them *φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν*. The precedent of the admission of these *φοβούμενοι* to the synagogues on certain conditions which guaranteed the absence of contagious pollution for the holy people was the solution which James had discovered, and which settled the question. That it did settle the question is again a proof of its practical and Palestinian character as explained above.

It is not implied by these considerations that the Council is necessarily historical or that the speeches should be so regarded. But they reflect an historical situation, and the narrative has been written by one who still understood this situation. It is another question whether or not it is right to make Acts xv so central as is usually done. Yet in my opinion this is rightly done, not only because our Acts is the Jerusalem-volume (in which the author often includes allusions to what occupied his

mind but was reserved by him for adequate development in the Roman volume), but also for other reasons, in which the historical interpretation of Acts xv, as proposed above, forms a part of the data.

#### IV

##### *The Omissions in Acts*

The well-known great omissions in Acts and the curious phenomenon of the we-sections seem to be specially connected with the question whether the author can have been a companion of Paul. Some of the introductory considerations become highly important here. Yet we need treat them only as far as is required for the exposition of our theory of a posthumous edition.

The omissions do not all bear upon "unpleasant" things. Insignificant details which we know by chance from what is left of Paul's writings are also absent. It is also worth while to observe the contrast with the mass of insignificant detail with which the we-sections have encumbered the book. This is the most obvious characteristic of them, and it need not be thought admirable, at least not according to ancient standards of literary composition. Another significant observation is that these we-sections bring us either aboard ship, or else, when for a time they reach *terra firma*, relate to prolonged presence only outside of Asia Minor. The most remarkable characteristic, however, seems to me that they regularly break off — or rather seem to slip through our fingers — as soon as anything important is going to happen. When Paul is to meet an Asian company and for the last time address them (20, 16-38), the personal accent disappears, though the author must almost inevitably have been present. The same happens at Jerusalem (21, 19-27, 1), and once more at Rome (28, 17-31), though again these seem to be cases of first-hand information.

Taking these facts together, one cannot but make a guess. Yet some further observations are first needed. As has already been observed, the adversaries of Paul at Jerusalem were Asian Jews; Cilician and Asian Jews were already in the action against Stephen. Paul was prohibited, when leaving the Anti-

ochian mission-field, from preaching in the province of Asia, and that by the Spirit of Jesus. The charge against Paul (21, 28) begins with teaching *κατὰ τοῦ λαοῦ* and ends with pollution (*κεκοίνωκεν*, perfect) of the holy place, ὁ ἅγιος τόπος οὗτος being not a mere synonym of τὸ ἱερόν. In a curious way Acts emphasizes the fact that Paul did not found a mission at Ephesus. He merely had a few days' dispute with the Jews in the synagogue — not outside, and these friendly disputes led to his being invited to return. Paul, however, declined this, and said that he would only resume this intercourse τοῦ θεοῦ θέλοντος (18, 21), the single instance of this expression in Acts. The real founders of the mission at Ephesus are Apollos, Priscilla, and Aquila. Putting this together with the fact that the we-sections decidedly keep aloof from Asia, the hasty visit to Antioch in chapter xviii stands out as a greater mystery than at first sight. Was there, perhaps, something which ought to have prevented Paul from taking up missionary work in Asia? Did the author of Acts think that this was a matter which required delicate handling? There is the Jerusalem-Antioch agreement. Paul went to Antioch in spite of friendly and promising relations with the Ephesian Jews and their synagogue. He goes in all haste, promising to return, but only τοῦ θεοῦ θέλοντος. Nothing is said about the purpose of this journey, or about its results. All we hear is that he departed from Antioch ποιήσας χρόνον τινά. Meagre as is the reference to his crossing καθεξῆς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν, this ποιήσας χρόνον τινά ἐξῆλθεν is the baldest note which possibly could stand. Not even a στηρίζων πάντας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς with reference to this evidently necessary visit to Antioch! And Antioch stands for how much in the career of Paul! Was it, perhaps, in the spirit of the Jerusalem-Antioch agreement that missionary work on the original principles of the Cyprian and Cyrenian Jews (11, 20) should not be prosecuted where it could be of consequence for the position of the ἅγιοι at Jerusalem? The regulations agreed upon were broad enough to make it appear unfair to neglect them, and for the heathen world they carried an obvious and wholly reasonable sense. Was Paul's transgressing them a matter of dubious interpretation among honest and serious people? One must bear in mind that



practical implications at that time must have had a greater importance than any questions of principle, especially in view of the imminence of the *παρουσία*. We are here, moreover, in an age, and among men, who had already broken away from tradition, itself a far stronger and more sacred power for them than with us.

This curious case of mysterious conciseness has its parallel in chapter xix (Ephesus). Here our theory that Luke left behind him a work unfinished in form, and in places hardly more than a provisional string of notes, again finds support. Several incidents have evidently been treated with some care, others merely indicated as a reminder. In 19, 1-7 we have the disciples of John, and again Paul is almost unconsciously introduced into missionary work on this dubious ground. In vss. 13-16 appear the sons of Sceva, an incident which introduces (vss. 18-19) the burning of the magical books, and aptly enough if we view it in the light of vs. 11: *δυνάμεις τε οὐ τὰς τυχούσας ὁ θεὸς ἐποίει* [note the imperfect] *διὰ τῶν χειρῶν Παύλου, ὥστε καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας ἀποφέρεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωτὸς αὐτοῦ σουδάρια ἢ σιμικίνθια καὶ ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν τὰ νόσους, τὰ τε πνεύματα τὰ πονηρὰ ἐκπορεύεσθαι*. It appears that vss. 11-19 form a rounded whole, and give a picture of Paul as seen by Oriental eyes: a great sheikh, as people would say now, a pious rabbi or monk in Jewish or Eastern-Christian modes, proving, as he inevitable would, a powerful *θαυματουργός*.

The colors of the picture are still somewhat pagan, rather staring. Luke has not had leisure, one might guess, to bring out the point that the *πνεῦμα* whose effluences prove so powerful is the same *ἅγιον πνεῦμα* which is distinctive for the new community, so distinctive that the disciples of John are saying (vs. 2), *ἀλλ' οὐδ' εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἔστιν ἠκούσαμεν*. The 'stir about the way' (vss. 23-40) stands also quite by itself, and it should be remarked that the use of the typically Semitic expression *ὁδός* (*derech*), without any addition to make it clearer, in the sense of 'Christianity,' is only found in Acts 9, 2; 19, 9; 23; 22, 4; 14; 22, and always in connection with Paul.

Information about the work of Paul at Ephesus, which, of course, it must have been the purpose of the author to give,

the other things being mere characterization or background, is limited to vss. 9*b* and 10*a*. Verses 8 and 9*a* give a mere introductory scheme, things that might have happened anywhere. The next verses bear distinctly the character of reminders. With ἀφώρισεν τοὺς μαθητάς the author points out the crisis in Paul's work at Ephesus, this meaning being made especially clear after the way in which the author has introduced Paul on this scene. As to καθ' ἡμέραν διαλεγόμενος ἐν τῇ σχολῇ Τυράννου, it is not so certain that further development was intended to begin here, but we know that passing as a new φιλοσοφία was a possible and practicable line of defence with regard to the law prohibiting clubs and like organizations. Chapter xvii warns us that this is not entirely out of the question. Next comes a rather loose chronological note (Luke has left his chronology in a more provisional state than was the custom), τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ ἔτη δύο. Then follows a summary possessing all the qualities of a reminder, ὥστε πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Ἀσίαν ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου. We need not emphasize the possibility that there may be something like a defence in this statement, which makes such a contrast with the way in which Acts appears to keep aloof from Asia, and also with the very small amount of information about the way in which these πάντες heard the saving λόγος τοῦ κυρίου.

Yet the author knew more; Paul had "friends" among the Asiarchs (vs. 31). The episode about the burned books reveals a special side of Paul's work in the town which gave its name to the ΕΦΕΣΙΑ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ. The sentence (vs. 21), ἔθετο ὁ Παῦλος ἐν τῷ πνεύματι διελθὼν τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαΐαν πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, εἰπὼν ὅτι μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι με ἐκεῖ δεῖ με καὶ Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν, is far from beautiful Greek, witness the uncorrected vulgarism ἀμφοτέροι in the episode of the sons of Sceva, but it is suggestive of information not yet worked into the narrative. The Ephesus chapter suggests not reticence, which would have produced a less clumsy result, but the traces of work done by a definite method and left unfinished. The looseness of the Ephesian data, their unequal and fragmentary character, let us see that the easier parts had been provisionally finished off and those requiring thought, as important for the

final whole, marked with a note of reminder. The reason why Paul's missionary work in Asia and at Ephesus might require delicate handling has already been suggested in our exposition of the situation.

This theory seems to be confirmed by the silence about the conflict at Corinth, which falls in these same years. Here express documentary evidence points to Palestine. Apollos the Ephesian teacher is also somehow involved. It is Paul who insists on the fundamental unity of the parties of Apollos, Cephas, and Christ with those Christians who named themselves after himself (1 Cor. 1, 12). Moreover, his authority as an apostle had been questioned. Difficulties concerning the *ἀγινωσύνη* of Christian communities had arisen. Evidently, if Paul preferred to keep silent about the Jerusalem-Antioch agreement, it must yet have counted for something in the case, and Paul's position, though explicable, must have been difficult to state fairly and convincingly. At first sight it was surely open to criticism. It is perhaps significant for the state of suspension in which Luke left his notes that the *ἐθνηριομάχησα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* (1 Cor. 15, 32) was not among them. This is also significant for the conservative methods of the editor, for it was an attractive topic for a small legendary embellishment.

With regard to the aloofness of the we-sections from Asia a curious textual fact may be noted in passing. In 16, 8 the 'Western' text, according to Zahn's reconstruction, based solely on the Latin of Irenaeus, runs: *διελθόντες δὲ τὴν Μυσίαν ἡμεῖς ἤλθομεν εἰς Τρωάδα*, which would imply that Luke had been with Paul in Asia from the beginning, and was a witness for the prohibition by the Spirit of Jesus (16, 7) or the *ἅγιον πνεῦμα* (16, 6). From the 'Western' text again (11, 27; 28) it could be inferred with some probability that he had left Antioch in Paul's company: *ἦν δὲ πολλὴ ἀγαλλίασις. συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.* I should not like to build on Zahn's text, though it is less capriciously constructed than Blass's, but it is not impossible that some genuine readings may be present among the mass of secondary ones. It is more easy to explain this by the theory of a posthumous edition than on the hypothesis of two original editions both from the author.



The loose ends of the we-sections have often been explained as due to insufficient redaction, though this same supposed redactor is accounted an expert in the handling of style and of historical detail. The fact, however, that the we-sections not only keep aloof from Asia but avoid giving evidence for any important speech or step of the Apostle, is well accounted for on our theory. Luke, not yet having reached the final stage of his work, despatched the stylistic side of the business in haste, but took care to mark the places where he did not want as yet to commit himself. His representation of Paul must have been to him a matter of much thought, which he had not yet finally matured. He did not wish to finish it too soon.

The Paul of our unfinished Acts is primarily the Antiochian missionary who abandoned the Antiochian field for enterprises of his own. Still worse, he departed from the comparatively liberal, at all events practical and important agreement upon which Jerusalem and Antioch had acquiesced. His invading Asia with these methods might be judged disloyal, especially after he had proclaimed the regulations in the South Galatian communities, which were founded by Barnabas and himself as Antiochian missionaries. Behind all this was the necessity still resting upon the ἄγιοι in Palestine, or even, with a view to defence before Roman courts, upon those outside Palestine, not to break with that religio-political entity which was constituted by the Jews, the proselytes, and the φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, or demi-proselytes. According to Acts the testimony of the Spirit was on both sides. That was the main difficulty. It was not doctrines, nor an undercurrent of doctrinal strife, that were decisive, but the fact that the ἅγιον πνεῦμα was manifesting itself equally in communities which as a whole did not keep to the Antiochian agreement. That made it impossible to reject Paul. Yet in Asia his name was supplanted by that of "John,"<sup>8</sup> and the communities to which the Epistle to the Ephesians is addressed are not of Paul's founding, however important they were on the map. There must be something behind this. It appears that the author of Acts has been wrestling with it. To my view it is clear that he had not yet reached a final decision

<sup>8</sup> Often more Pauline than Paul himself!

about his representation of Paul on the critical point, as seen by him.

He has not left us wholly in the dark as to the direction his thoughts were taking. The Jerusalem-Antioch agreement is made central. The difficulty with Asia is discernible. That Paul's relation to Antioch in respect to both these points was germane to the whole question is clear enough. The writer is so much interested in Antioch that even as early as 6, 5, forgetting to tell whence Stephen came — a man so important in his scheme, and dispatching Philip with the other five of the Seven, he takes care to emphasize the Antiochian connection of Nicolas! Yet the hasty journey to Antioch in chapter xviii is the last we hear of either Antioch or Antiochians, notwithstanding Paul's years of imprisonment in Caesarea, not far away. That Jerusalem behaved coolly towards Paul is not obscured. Just here (21, 25) the footnote concerning the agreement is significantly and clumsily put in. And that the same was the case in Rome is equally obvious. The two or three words which would have sufficed in the summary of 28, 31 to suggest more friendly relations with the Christian community there, are absent. During two whole years Paul is receiving "all those that went in unto him," *κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διδάσκων τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἀκωλύτως*, but not even a *παρακαλούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκεῖ ἀδελφῶν* is added. Yet Luke has taken care to introduce the *ὄντες τῶν Ἰουδαίων πρῶτοι* (28, 17). Their presence was necessary to mark the fact that here—though differently—the real difficulty was about the same as that which the Jerusalem-Antioch agreement was meant to meet, and that Paul again was putting himself outside that entente, arguing his point from the Old Testament, and fully confident of being in the way of God: *αὐτοὶ* [sc. *τὰ ἔθνη*] *καὶ ἀκούσονται*. After all, Paul was justified by history. The Roman church became as Pauline as a church could succeed in being. Perhaps Luke lived to see it. At all events he lived to see Palestine and its *ἄγιοι* baffled in their hopes by the catastrophe of 70 A.D. But this must have added to his difficulties.

I think the view that our Acts, unfinished as it is, was written

by a companion of Paul, is wholly tenable. This companion was the Antiochian convert Luke, perhaps (cf. *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. II, pp. 55, 61) a Syrian by birth. The tradition respecting this point is confirmed by such details as 11, 26, ἐγένετο . . . χρηματίσαι τε πρώτως ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς, and by others of analogous character, especially by the Antiochian attitude of some of the we-sections, and by the general representation of history in our Acts.

This companion of Paul, though admiring him with a certain degree of understanding, was not himself taught at the feet of Gamaliel. He was evidently a layman, not a possessor of Roman citizenship, but a peregrinus, a provincial. It seems probable that he felt sympathy with those practical difficulties of the East which Paul, especially when carried along by higher motives, was apt to override.

It is of course probable that in these feelings our author was representative of a growing majority. The prominence of the name of John in Asia Minor suggests that those who may have preferred the traditions of authentic Paulinism were speedily crowded out. Luke has thought it advisable to commit to writing his views on the history of the early spread of Christianity, and of the conflicts and friction which accompanied this process. He has plainly found it an exacting task to justify Paul fully in the eyes of the audience which he intended to address; at least he seems not to have succeeded in finishing his work or even in elaborating all his notes.

The strength of his position, and of the course he intended to follow, lay in the testimony of the Spirit. It was the Spirit itself that had justified the course which history had taken. But even after having made the Spirit the main actor in this second treatise, and the continuator of the work of the Lord by means of human agents, the most critical points regarding Paul have remained undeveloped, a reminder here and there being all that we have.

The silence of Paul about Luke is also significant. Once he is mentioned as ὁ ἱατρὸς ὁ ἀγαπητός, again at two other places, but also in the company of Demas. In Col. 4, 14 there is no συνεργός, not even an ἐν Χριστῷ; everywhere he is mentioned



last, there seems to be a distance. Moreover, Colossians is a letter addressed to an Asian community which Paul himself had not founded. In 2 Tim. 4, 11 we have the bald Λουκᾶς ἐστὶν μόνος μετ' ἐμοῦ, in Philemon 24, Μάρκος, Ἀρίσταρχος, Δημᾶς, Λουκᾶς, οἱ συνεργοί μου. Yet it is a legitimate inference from the we-sections also that Luke had been a companion of the apostle at times which are amply referred to in the epistles. Was Luke somehow the Antiochian conscience of Paul — ἀγαπητός, but nevertheless sometimes not welcome?

## V

*Paul in Athens*

Although E. Norden's hypothesis respecting Acts xvii has been overthrown by Harnack and others, it has some relation to our views on the present subject. I cannot accept the alternative (Beginnings of Christianity, vol. II, p. 136) of inadequate skill, when Norden's theory regarding the Preface is discussed. Neither can I accept Norden's tentative reconstruction of the original preface itself, νυνὶ δὲ τὰ συνεχῇ τοῖτοισ, ἃ τε αὐτὸς παρὼν εἶδον, ἃ τε παρ' ἄλλων ἀξιοπύστων ὄντων ἐπυθόμην συγγράψαι πειράσομαι μέχρι τῆς ἐπὶ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπιδημίας τοῦ Παύλου. This is not Lucan. It is very questionable whether this text would have answered his purpose, and surely it would not have been worth the trouble of excision, not even on Norden's own premises.

With respect to the Apollonius-hypothesis as to chapter xvii, Windisch also (Beginnings of Christianity, vol. II, p. 313) finds it "impossible to agree" with Norden, and shows "no greater inclination to adopt" the modified form in which Corsen has couched the proposal. Yet he thinks it "extremely probable that the author of Acts had literary models for the speech on Mars Hill." I see no necessity for this suggestion, but I should like to draw attention to a note of the Editors (Beginnings of Christianity, vol. II, p. 189), "It is noticeable that this [17, 31 ἡμέραν ἐν ᾗ μέλλει κρίνειν τὴν οἰκουμένην . . . ἐν ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὥρισεν, πίστιν παρασχὼν πᾶσιν, ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν] is an example of unmixed 'Son of Man' Christology . . . a less developed

form of thought than that of the editor of Acts." They add that though "speeches in the literature of this period are the least likely part of any book to have escaped revision, and may even be the free invention of editors, it is also true that the comparison of Luke with Matthew and Mark suggests that he found speeches in his sources, and contented himself with comparatively small revisions." This falls in easily with our suggestions.

A remark of W. K. L. Clarke also seems important (Beginnings of Christianity, vol. II, p. 98): "Taking the speeches as a whole there is a clear distinction between the first and second half of the Acts in respect to the influence of the Old Testament; in the later chapters it is far less marked. . . . The rule is not universally carried out; *e.g.* in the Areopagus speech, chapter xvii, delivered to an audience supposed to be unfamiliar with the Jewish Scriptures, there are a number of literary reminiscences."

Another observation of the Editors should be noted (Beginnings of Christianity, vol. II, p. 196): "In that respect Paul's epistles are the complement of Acts. He bases his argument in favour of a resurrection on Jewish eschatological belief, with the addition — where he speaks to the Gentiles — of the clinching argument that Jesus had actually risen. Norden missed this point in *Agnostos Theos*, where he treats the Resurrection as synonymous with *ἀθανασία*."

In somewhat the same way Emmet has drawn attention in the case of 1 and 2 Thessalonians to the stress laid by Paul on the Kingdom (Acts 17, 7; 1 Thess. 2, 13; 2 Thess. 1, 5), with the consequent special interest in the Parousia. There are more of such points which Norden has missed. The real strength of his contention that Acts xvii is an intrusion of alien matter must be philological, exact and well-informed interpretation. Even here we are disappointed. In Beginnings of Christianity, vol. II, pp. 51 f., I noted cases of semitizing Greek in chapter xvii, applying only the insufficient standards of Torrey, namely vss. 19 *δυνάμεθα γινῶναι*; 20 *εἰσφέρεις εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς ἡμῶν*; 25 *ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων*; 26 *ἐποίησεν ἐξ ἐνὸς πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων* . . . *κατοικίας αὐτῶν*; 31 *ἐν ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὤρισεν*; *ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ*

μέσων αὐτῶν. More might be added, for example: 16 παρωξύνετο τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ; 17 κατὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν; 34 κολληθέντες αὐτῷ. Again only Torrey's method is applied. But putting these cases over against those from chapter xvii which Norden has adduced for Atticism (Agnostos Theos, pp. 333-336, 'ΛΕΞΕΙΣ ΑΤΤΙΚΑΙ in dem athenischen Kapitel der Acta'), one may feel some doubts when reading his conclusion (p. 335): "Taking everything together I cannot believe that the redactor of Acts, whose language really has no Attic quality, could have composed this passage without a literary model. Since we have shown that a speech of Apollonius himself, or a biography in which it was reported, was used, the supposition naturally suggests itself that, like the allusion to the trial of Socrates, so these other Attic ἀστέισμοί have found entrance into our Acts by this road." If we neglect Norden's general considerations, as largely mistaken, the evidence reduces itself to the use of σπερμολόγος (vs. 18), καινότερον and λέγειν ἢ (καὶ) ἀκούειν (vs. 21). This is not much. It is not enough, since notable cases of sporadic atticizing occur all over the book, even in matters of syntax (see Beginnings of Christianity, vol. II, pp. 33 f.).

Interpretation not forming the strength of Norden's position, it is perhaps better to state briefly some salient points. I leave aside the *mise en scène*, and the allusion to Socrates (cf. my *Handelingen der Apostelen*, pp. 118-120). In the first place, then, it is evident that this speech contains many expressions which have been neither felt nor thought after the manner of popular Greek philosophy. The "Epicurean and Stoic philosophers" were soon aware of this, and consequently they treated the provincial with little respect, trying to scare this would-be Socrates by conducting him to the Royal Stoa, where the Areopagus — as Cicero tells us that the supreme governmental body in Athens was again called in his time — held its sessions. That it was in session is not implied. Nor is it intimated that Paul was defending his action before that court. He is simply addressing the public over the heads of these gentlemen. The presence of a stray member of the august body does not constitute a session. It would probably have been something resembling contempt of court to bring Paul before it in such a way



and on such a charge. The first thing, however, to be observed is that Paul does not proclaim the *theos agnostos*, but his appeal is far more carefully worded. He does not say *ὃν οὖν* but, significantly, *ὃ οὖν ἀγνοοῦντες εὐσεβεῖτε*. And this *ὃ* is by no means the philosophical *τὸ θεῖον*. Throughout the whole speech the personal God of the Jews is presented as Creator, as Master of heaven and earth, and — what is the cardinal point and a specifically Jewish thought — as the Supreme Leader of history. He has, as a sovereign “overlooked the times of ignorance” (vs. 30, cf. Rom. 3, 25). At this present it has pleased him to command “men that they should all everywhere repent” — which is not exactly a Greek notion, though both seeming and real parallels might be adduced. But the motive for this message of repentance is Jewish in form and contents: “inasmuch as he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the *οἰκουμένην* in righteousness.” The prompt mockery of the alert Athenian spirit shows how little the neutral, or sometimes philosophically colored, wording could hide the essentially foreign character of this train of reasoning. This may have been in the purpose of the author. He often lets his speakers be interrupted and prevented from fully developing their views. But the speech is said to be so little Pauline that the original author of Acts can not be made responsible for it.

This point requires some consideration in view of the theory about the genesis of Acts which we are maintaining. It should not be overlooked that one of the most characteristic differences between the ancients and ourselves is that they were listeners, while we are readers. Even books were written for audiences, not for the corner of the hearth. Our Acts is in places much less fit for this than the Gospel: the Gospel is a finished *λόγος*; our Acts has not been completed, and is far from having received the finishing touch. I cannot but count it a mistake to base an argument on the supposition that an author of such abilities and relatively so much culture was unable to reproduce somehow the rhetoric of a public speech. He must often have listened to such speeches. Every man of culture, and surely an Antiochian, knew by observation, if not from his schoolboy acquaintance with literature, some of their tricks and many of

the catchwords. It was their favorite sport. Whether Paul was acquainted with the rules of the game is another question. At Jerusalem they were not taught, at least not by Gamaliel. Cypriote and, especially, Cyrenian Jews may have been conversant with them. And Tarsus was a home of rhetoric and Stoic philosophy. The main difficulty is usually found in the quotation from Cleanthes or Aratus. Here the rules of public speaking come in. In diatribes, especially in those of a public and controversial character, a *captatio benevolentiae* was inevitable. The question of lack of veracity should not be put here, for nobody was deceived by what might be said at that point. But the same principle applies to the game itself. An orator giving away his case for sheer honesty would have found no sympathy and scarcely a hearing. He would have been judged a boor, and his action an insult to the discernment of the public. Now Paul seems to be untrue to his own tenets at two points, both by claiming divine descent for man in the quotation, and by using the term τὸ θεῖον (vs. 29). These points should be considered in the light of the ancient ἀγωνιστική. To form a judgment on them apart from this art of controversy is not fair; we should analyse the case as it stands.

Of course Paul did not believe that man was a μόνιον τοῦ θεοῦ. Nor did he ever abandon the personal God of the Jews for pantheism. But Paul had something of the method of the rabbi. He could cover these expressions somehow by Old Testament authority. According to ancient Hebrew views man consisted of flesh made alive by an infusion of divine *ruach*. When this πνεῦμα is taken back, man returns to dust (cf., for instance, Ez. 37, 1-17). This *ruach* is by no means identical with the divine — and therefore imperishable, ἀφθόρος or ἀθάνατος — something, or 'ego,' which was believed in by his opponents or, at least, by his audience. But on the point in debate, namely, that "we" — Paul and his audience — "ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and device of man," because "in him we live, and move, and have our being," the fact that Paul personally took this ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν differently from the way

in which it was understood by his audience, was not relevant. At least Greek rhetorical law would not have thought it relevant, especially in a speech introduced as a sort of defence.

In the same way τὸ θεῖον may have been used as an equivalent<sup>9</sup> for the Jewish expressions of awe for the transcendent God, *shamaim*, *maqom*, and the like. That by them Paul understood one thing and his audience another, is quite in keeping with the rules of the ancient agonistic art. Paul does not, however, dissimulate his divergent mentality, creation being quite another thing from ἀπόρροια, προβολή, or whatever term he might have adopted as more suitable to the philosophical views of the day. His use of ὁ θεός is also different enough in its context from what one may find in the pages of Epictetus or Seneca. The thesis of Norden (p. 29): "The traditional type of an apostolic missionary sermon adapted to a definite public by means of allusions to tenets of Stoic theology; with this result the analysis of the speech on the side of its ideas is finished," cannot stand as a fair statement of the case in Acts 17, 22-32. There is a mass of material in Norden's pages that may serve to enrich the margin of our Wetstein, but the real problems lie elsewhere.

At the outset there is something remarkable in a judgment of the οἰκουμένη, and not of the κόσμος. The principalities and powers stood for something with Paul, and the day of judgment concerned them in the first place. That man is only immortal by becoming a καινή κτίσις is also a thought which, even as an undercurrent, does not seem to influence this speech. But the most striking omission is in vs. 31, to which attention was also drawn by the Editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Here it is not stated that the Christ is a heavenly being. Now the notion of a universal judgment by a θεός being far less shocking than that which is proposed in the speech, the remark of the Editors about the "Son of Man Christology" acquires a special force. That conversion, 'pneumatic' evidence, and especially the κύριος-doctrine are not found, is explicable by the situation. Far from being a model missionary speech, this discourse of Acts xvii is a fragment, the speaker being inter-

<sup>9</sup> The expression is sometimes used for local divinities, especially on foreign soil.



rupted before he comes to his main topic. And this is consciously done, and is emphasized by the author in the words of vs. 32, ἀκουσόμεθά σου περὶ τούτου καὶ πάλιν.

The real difficulty with this speech is not in its form. Neither is it in the superficial Stoic color, which, as is shown above, does not reach its contents. It is in the contents. And the difficulty is not so much a difference from the Paulinism of Western tradition, for that need not count at its face-value, but consists in omitting what was vital to the imagery and the structure of Paul's religious beliefs.

If this speech is by the original author, he had given much attention to it. It is not carelessly composed. The Atticisms which the situation required are in their right places. The Semitisms came in without being called, but they have been nicely shaded off, and the resulting whole is not too motley. The incompleteness of the discourse as a representation of Paul's views is skilfully brought out, and the *mise en scène* is as good as it could be.

The main objection is, therefore, a doctrinal one. Could a companion of Paul make him say the things pointed out above? Could he let him keep silent about those topics which are left out? Here this question is inevitable, for the "Son of Man Christology" runs counter to the very intelligently developed situation. An "adoptionist" source seems to be out of the question in these surroundings.

It is therefore necessary to consider how this passage fits in with the plan of Acts. It seems to be a culminating point. Has this point a natural place in a part of the whole curve? Is it prepared for, or does it prepare for something? Is it related, or does it stand isolated? And if the latter be the case, can it be accounted for in some intelligible way?

Within our Acts the topic of Paul and pagan monotheism does not stand isolated, though it is not prominent. There is 16, 17 f.: οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι δοῦλοι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου εἰσίν, οἵτινες καταγγέλλουσιν ὑμῖν ὁδὸν σωτηρίας . . . διαπονηθεὶς δὲ Παῦλος καὶ ἐπιστρέψας τῷ πνεύματι εἶπεν· Παραγγέλλω σοι ἐν ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῆς· καὶ ἐξῆλθεν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ. The Hypsistos-cult was a syncretistic form of pagan monotheism, and the

διαπονηθείς is proof of how disagreeable it must have been for Paul to see his message and missionary action confounded with it. As it seems to have had some relation with Judaism of doubtful correctness, the sensitiveness of Paul on this point is significant.

The scene at Athens again shows Paul in frankly pagan surroundings. But conceding that Paul was capable of seeking contact with pagan philosophers, it emphasizes that such contact meant conflict. Paul's recognition of Stoic morality and knowledge of God — Athenodorus was a Tarsian, and Paul himself is found saying (21, 39), Ταρσεὺς τῆς Κιλικίας, οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης — is attested by Romans 1, 18–21 and 2, 14–16, and must have been well known. It required, in the plan of Acts as set forth above, some correction or counterpoise with a view to Jewish sensibilities. Just as 16, 17 f. is an answer to malevolent combinations of the aims of the apostle with the Hypsistos-cult, so the Athenian conflict seems to be an answer to still graver suspicions. The answer is that Paul was simply not understood at Athens, and was made to see that his doctrines did not sufficiently interest a pagan audience. The express and vivid relation of this *échec* must have been made so conspicuous in order to serve some purpose. The opening verses of 1 Cor. 2, for example, ἐλθὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς . . . οὐ καθ' ὑπεροχὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας . . . οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινα ἐν ὑμῖν τι εἰδέναι . . . οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις . . . μὴ ἢ ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπων . . . σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, considered as looking back to the days of his arrival from Athens, receive illumination from Acts xvii, but they are not adapted to provide a basis for it on the supposition that Acts xvii was freely invented. Moreover there is enough of Judaism in the speech itself. This is emphasized by its failure to catch the attention of the audience, and further down (*e.g.* 18, 18; 21, 21–26; 22, 17 f.; 23, 1; 6) the author has emphasized the Jewish element in Paul's message clearly enough.

The end of this intermezzo on Paul and paganism is marked by the Gallio-episode (18, 12–18), where the Corinthian Jews abuse Paul as a Jew and the Roman governor pronounces a nonsuit: ζητήματά ἐστιν περὶ λόγου καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ νόμου τοῦ καθ'

*hymas*, thus giving official testimony to the Jewish character of Paul's message.

These three cases in chapters xvi, xvii, xviii, are therefore related by a common purpose, which is clearly enough a defence of Paul. Here the author evidently had made up his mind, and had given the finishing touch to his representation of Paul's case. The case itself was not so difficult as that of the apostle's course of action respecting the Antioch-Jerusalem agreement. To treat Acts xvii without reference to this context into which it is put by the plan of Acts, seems to me a serious mistake.

That the three chapters must be ascribed to one of the earliest strata in Acts — on our hypothesis to the papers left by Luke — is probable. The desire to clear Paul from alleged contact with syncretistic or pagan monotheism can only have been vivid at an early date. An early date is also the most advisable for the "Son of Man Christology" — if it be found here. I do not think it necessary to press the passage in this direction. Of course there is no adoptionist Christology in Paul's writings, but, on the other hand, he never throws any doubt upon the physical humanity of the Christ. One might stretch the sense of 2 Cor. 5, 16 *εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκουμεν*, but there are the *ἀνθρωπος-* passages in Rom. 5, 15; 1 Cor. 15, 47; and Phil. 2, 8. Moreover, the use of 'man' in the figurative sense for the heavenly Christ is prominent enough in Rom. 6, 2 f.; 2 Cor. 11, 2; Gal. 4, 27. But all this does not remove the difficulty which is found in Luke's making Paul responsible for a seemingly adoptionist Christology. It is removed, or at least greatly relieved, if we consider *ὃ ὥρισεν* as a veiled reference to Old Testament testimony concerning the "Man," for example, Zech. 6, 12, *ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ, Ἀνατολὴ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*, a well-known entry from the manuals of 'Testimonies.' This same text is alluded to by Luke himself in Luke 1, 78, *ἐπισκέψεται ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους*, and it should be noted that in Acts Paul is represented as using a collection of testimonies, of which even headlines of some entries have crept into the text, namely, 26, 23, *εἰ παθητὸς ὁ χριστός*, and *εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει καταγγέλλειν τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*; cf. vs. 24, *τὰ πολλὰ γράμματα*, and vs. 27, *πιστεύεις τοῖς προφήταις*.

W. K. L. Clarke (*Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. II, pp. 80, 98) has drawn attention to the unexpected frequency of LXX reminiscences in this Areopagus speech. It is not necessary to base the case on Zech. 6, 12 only, for there are more places of the same nature. I may refer to Ps. 79 (78), 18 *γενηθήτω ἡ χεὶρ σου ἐπ' ἄνδρα δεξιᾶς σου καὶ ἐπὶ υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου*, or Prov. 29, 9 *ἀνὴρ σοφὸς κρινεῖ ἔθνη*, not to mention the places in which angels and other heavenly beings appear as men; for example, Ezek. 40, 3 f.; 43, 6; Dan. 9; 10; 12. Genesis 18, 1 f., and 32, 22 are also stock quotations in the various collections of testimonies, in Justin Martyr, Cyprian, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius, and Dionysius bar-Salibi. For Zech. 6, 12, cf. Justin Martyr, Dial. 100, 15; 106, 16; 121, 8; Eusebius, Dem. Ev. vi, 14, 2; vii, 3, 41; Bar-Salibi, *Against the Jews*, v, 16; vii, 13. With regard to the use of *ὀρίζειν*, which is a Lucan word, it should be observed that Rom. 1, 4 *τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ* gives the only parallel in the New Testament.

If we leave aside the question about the historical character of Acts xvii, as well as that about the part of the author in its composition, there seems to be a fair case for its Lucan origin. It belongs to a group of narratives which aim at defending Paul and his message against the charge of association with pagan or semi-pagan surroundings, an accusation which would of course be so contrary to the spirit of the Antiochian agreement as to render all further cleansing of Paul's missionary character futile.

## VI

### *Conclusions, and the Corroboration of Linguistic Evidence*

The general situation of the problem, the plan of Acts, the significance and interpretation of Acts xv and the preceding narratives from an historical point of view, the great omissions, and the we-sections all raise the question whether the author could have been a companion of Paul. Finally, the problem of Acts xvii appears to be more satisfactorily approachable on our hypothesis of a posthumous edition of papers left unfinished by Luke than by Norden's proposals. It has been necessary to consider these points, for no theory about the genesis of Acts



can be offered which does not somehow become involved in questions of interpretation. In our case, however, there was no need to deal with more than the great lines of some of the many problems.

Posthumous edition is frequent enough in antiquity. I need not refer to the theories of the fathers concerning the authorship of Moses, or of other biblical or extra-canonical writings such as the Solomonic apocrypha. The best known parallel is perhaps the *Aeneid*, which, contrary to Vergil's wish, was edited in a form which the poet thought imperfect. Among the works of Cicero one might look for the same. With Seneca the problem of the *Octavia* has recently been again attacked on the hypothesis of a posthumous edition of an imperfect work. Howald, the latest editor of Plato's *Letters*, who declares *Letters* vi, vii, and viii to be genuine, considers *Letter* vii to be a rough draft mixed with a planned apology which never reached its final form. In this way he explains the stylistic and literary deficiencies of *Letter* vii, which nevertheless he deems an authentic document of the highest interest. One need but remember the doubtful origin of much that goes under the name of Aristotle to see that the cases are as numerous as could be expected.

Viewing the points that have been discussed or mentioned in the previous paragraphs and adding some fresh ones, it is best to begin with the most general and seemingly most subjective of all.

Compared with the Gospel, our *Acts* is not up to the standard of a work meant for reading aloud, as ancient books generally were. It is too little of a *λόγος*, though professing to be such in its preface. The author's Greek is a combination of conflicting elements, and on the whole the style of *Acts*, especially in the first half, must have been a serious drawback. This is the more serious since he may be said to be the most Greek of the New Testament writers, who — according to ancient standards — certainly leave much to be desired. Such a badly balanced composition as Peter's speech in chapter ii, consisting of two conglomerates of Old Testament texts, is below the standard of the man who in the hymns of the first chapters of the Gospel succeeded in combining a cento of testimonies into a composi-

tion of a decidedly Hebrew character in spite of Greek wording and balance. The attempts to divide Stephen's speech between a redactor and an original document are in themselves and in their mutual destruction eloquent for the quality of this composition. That the verbatim quotation of sources, especially in such abundance, runs counter to Greek style may be excused by the fact that the use of testimonies was characteristic of the Christian missionary and polemist. Bad style, however, showing itself in defective structure of speeches and narratives, was unnecessary. Even if all this be ascribed with Torrey to Aramaic documents, Luke is not excused for not having decently worked over his materials and for leaving them in this raw state. Had he done otherwise, it would have been impossible to be certain of their existence. It would have been altogether out of the question to surmise the language in which they were couched. It would also have been impossible to get behind him and trace his documents by means of doublets. A man, for example, who in 4, 36 explains the surname of *Ἰωσήφ ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρνάβας* by his deed of heroic sacrifice of property, seemingly forgetful of the fact that in vss. 32-35 a series of even stronger instances has been given almost resembling communism, is not an author, even according to our standards. There are but two explanations: either his work has suffered disarrangement or we are in presence of a series of not yet finally arranged notes. The latter hypothesis must be preferred, for it is scarcely possible that a Greek author, treating this subject and conscious of its importance, should publish a narrative in which such a scene as the outpouring of the Holy Spirit occurs at two places and in different surroundings. It is not fair to accuse Luke, even as a translator or compiler, of such carelessness, for in the case of the miraculous feeding he has made his choice and suppressed one of the doublets. I will not insist on the thrice repeated narrative of the conversion of Paul, and still less on the differences to be observed there. Such differences are, within limits, natural for an ancient author in utilizing even one and the same document, but three times is certainly excessive. As was observed above with reference to the Cornelius episode, repetition is a clumsy and Semitic mode of emphasis. Luke was quite capable

of reaching the desired effect by less outlandish means. There are ancient examples of the use of we-sections mixed with ordinary narrative, as Norden has sufficiently pointed out, but the way in which it is done here, and the type of narrative to which it is applied, is, to say the least, singular.

Putting aside for the moment smaller philological points which will clench the argument, Acts must be said to be rather disappointing as a history. There is abundance of detail where the details do not further the aims of either author or audience, but the narrative itself proceeds without due regard for proportion or continuity. We must be careful not to judge this phenomenon by our measures, for there is good evidence from Plutarch and from Vergil that in this Luke was in harmony with contemporary taste (cf. *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. II, p. 65, note 1). Yet it remains true that *sunt certi denique fines*, and Luke has passed them. Insufficiency of material, deficient information, is the usual answer of the critic. This may be true, but other ancient authors would have covered this defect with the most elusive grace, or even have suggested that by their own good pleasure they were withholding information which would not sufficiently interest their readers.

Luke has often been laid on the rack of logic, of such logic as the modern historian is expected to show. There is injustice in such methods, and the results do not always inspire confidence, but Luke does invite us to treat him in such a way. I should not like to say that 18, 2, the note about the expulsion of Priscilla and Aquila from Rome under Claudius, is in flat contradiction with 28, 22, where the Roman Jews meet Paul, but some information concerning the change of government and Nero's ascension to the throne might have been inserted at a fit place. Many questions have been raised with regard to the information withheld by the sudden breaking off of several of the we-sections, and though some seem irrelevant others appear justified. Considering those parts of the narrative which are in a comparatively finished state, the author must have been conscious of the imperfect character of his work in this respect. The way in which he leaves us in the dark (or rather leaves several of his principal actors at the roadside) is irritating. It is

so much a habit with him that the reappearance of Agabus in 21, 10 after we left him in 11, 28 is a surprise. But incidents at which the author himself has been present are treated in the same way. As has been observed above on the Ephesus chapter, we are evidently in presence of an unfinished work, in which notes in various states of elaboration are glued together, alternating with 'reminders' which might have grown into chapters. We have suggested on some occasions why these reminders were not yet developed, and for these guesses the actual contents of the narrative have provided a consistent and reasonable explanation. For the exposition of our theory, however, it would be superfluous to go through the whole of Acts, noting each point which might come under these headings and comparing the advantages of the theory of a posthumous edition with other suggestions.

But to round off the case some philological arguments must be added.<sup>10</sup> The repetition of οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες (8, 4) in 11, 19 is strange. The inserted footnote-reference to Acts xv in 21, 25 is also a glaring case of unrevised composition. The confused ending of the Ephesian town-clerk's speech (19, 40) is delightful, but the delight is quite modern. Such unconventional ways of effecting ἐκπληξίς were not to the taste of antiquity, at least in a serious historical *logos*.

The many vulgarisms in our Acts, even outside the chapters where the use of Aramaic and other sources somewhat excuses them, clash with the evidence for a sound school-knowledge of the more literary idioms. This is best explained on our hypothesis of a not yet revised text. That the author would have corrected many of these errors of form is sure, since he has taken care, for instance, to abandon altogether the use of πλὴν in the sense of ἀλλά, which is so conspicuous in his Gospel. We may also feel sure that the habit of returning to the same phrase, which is natural enough in writing notes but a defect in final composition, at least when it occurs so often, would have been corrected. In his final redaction, Luke would probably also have made his choice between the more literary local πρό and

<sup>10</sup> For fuller discussion of these matters, see my 'Use of the Greek Language in Acts,' *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. II, pp. 30-65.



the semitizing *ἐμπροσθεν* (12, 6 and 14, 13, against 10, 4 and 18, 17), and have availed himself of the advantages of the periphrastic construction of the verb, needed for Semitic color, but which he has occasionally neglected (*e.g.* 25, 10 against 26, 26). Somewhat parallel is the case of the constructions of *ἀκούω* with genitive and accusative. In Attic the distinction of the construction with the genitive for subjective consciousness and with the accusative for external fact is not absolutely maintained, but once going over his writings for final revision, Luke would surely have observed the rule of the schoolmen, and have removed such difficulties as are obvious in 9, 7; 11, 7; 22, 7 contrasted with 9, 4; 22, 9; 14; 26, 14. The double genitive of the thing in 21, 1 could scarcely have escaped alteration. We may be sure of this, because there are traces of incipient correction — soon abandoned, as would be expected under our view of the genesis of Acts. The Aramaic sources show the Lucan litotes, *e.g.* in 1, 5, of which the next instance reappears only at 12, 18. Further on *οὐχ ὁ τυχών* is found twice, and *οὐκ ὀλίγος* repeatedly. So literary niceties are occasionally present even in these first chapters, little polished as they are. By a slight syntactical error Luke betrays himself as the author of the speech of Gamaliel. Of course such a thing would not have been tolerated by the author in a final text. We might add the sharp contrast between 26, 10, which is vigorous Greek, quite worthy of the author and of the occasion, and the lame ending of the same speech with the headlines from Luke's book of testimonies still present in it. Having begun his literary career by composing the Gospel out of ready material, his task being mainly the arrangement, attention to details, filing, and fitting proper to a redactor, it is wholly explicable that the same habits make their appearance here too, but the process is in its preliminary stage. Even while collecting his notes we see Luke making an occasional correction in advance of the later revision. In this way the conflicting elements in the style of Acts receive their explanation. But there are bad cases left, for instance the genitive absolute and accusative with infinitive, both carelessly faulty, in 22, 17. Equally instructive instances may be found in 8, 7, a mixture of two constructions; in 18, 22 f.; 19, 16,

consecutive combinations of participles; 23, 23 f., awkward transition from oratio recta to obliqua; in 24, 19, a bad knot of irregularities; in 27, 2, where the subject is to be inferred from an oblique case in a manner that is hardly Greek. I may refer also to the article of A. Nairne in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1919–20, pp. 171 f., on Acts 26, 28, where parallels from the LXX and Tacitus are given for the colloquialism ποιεῖν βασιλεία in the sense of ‘playing the king,’ as an analogy for the words of King Agrippa χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι.

It is also worth while to observe that after a certain point some better usages are observed, for instance οὐ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ after 19, 26. Another good instance of this phenomenon is the greater frequency in II Acts of the future participle in a final sense, which occurs once in 8, 27, but might have displaced, with great advantage to the style of Acts from the point of view of contemporary judgment, several of the clumsy constructions of τοῦ with the infinitive. The stylistic conscience of our author also shows itself in that even one of his Lucanisms, ἐνώπιον, which is used by Paul and is again frequent in the Apocalypse, is not entirely abandoned (the ratio between Gospel, I Acts, and II Acts being 22: 12: 3), but, at the same time, is corrected. In Acts 19, 9; 19 and 27, 35 it stands correctly for the classical ἐναντίον. Such changes have in the field of grammar and style the same nature as the notes characterized as ‘reminders’ with respect to the contents. Such observations seem to me all to point in one direction, that of a final revision, not yet executed, but already definitely planned.

This final revision was never carried out, as appears from the fact (observed by Harnack, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 159–177) that these traces of carelessness of every description are equally spread over the whole work. Later research has confirmed this observation, and even so conservative a scholar as the Roman Catholic Wikenhauser (*Die Apostelgeschichte und ihr Geschichtswert*, 1921, p. 156) has catalogued a series of them, including even such points as the contradictory differences between the letter of Lysias and the narrative in chapter xxiii. Many of these incongruities are of such a nature as to give definite support to our theory of a posthumous edition.

Against the contentions of R. Schütz (Apostel und Jünger, 1921), who strikes a new note in the search for the sources of Acts, my principal objection is that the author forces the contrasts by neglecting the *trait d'union* formed by the common eschatological beliefs, and, in the case of Paul, that justice is not done to his fidelity to the "expectation of Israel." Whether the different usage of *μαθηταί* and *ἀπόστολοι*, of *Ἱερουσαλήμ* and *Ἱεροσόλυμα* have now been finally explained as due to an Hellenistic and a Judaistic source, may be left undecided; at all events the use of the two names for the Holy City without consistent regard to the local color — which might in places justify the use of the less Greek form — is a case of insufficient revision. It is, however, worth while to observe, with regard to the methods of the editors of Luke's remains, that they have not corrected away the *μαθηταί*, and that, after the stress laid on the prominence of the Twelve in the first chapter, the rest of the narrative does not seem to have suffered any systematic revision in this direction.

Finally, we must consider a point in which the question of the degree of revision which Acts may have suffered at other hands comes to the front in connection with nicer questions of grammar and text. In the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1922-23, pp. 183-186, C. O. Chambers has thrown new light on the vexed question of *ἀσπασάμενοι* in Acts 25, 13. The title of his article, 'On a Use of the Aorist Participle in Some Hellenistic Writers,' points to the direction in which the solution is found. From a comparison of 2 Macc. 11, 36; 4 Macc. 3, 13; Acts 12, 25; 25, 13; and Heb. 9, 12, and of the manuscript evidence in 1 Macc. 15, 28; 2 Macc. 4, 23; 11, 32; 9, 23, it appears that the aorist participle may be used to denote purpose (like the future participle), if (a) the main verb be a verb of motion or the like, (b) the participle be placed after it, and (c) the participle be aorist active or middle. In Acts 12, 25 — to quote Chambers —

the question has been somewhat prejudiced by Rackham's unfortunate arguments in favour of taking *πληρώσαντες* to denote subsequent action. It is therefore necessary to make a fresh start. If Harnack's J A source is read consecutively (by omitting xii. 1-24), no one can have any doubt that xii. 25

belongs to xi. 30 and not to xiii. 1, and that by retaining the reading of the great MSS *els* the passage makes perfect sense. 'So Barnabas and Saul returned to Jerusalem to fulfil the ministration, taking with them John.' The mere fact that in xiii. 1 Saul is separated from Barnabas by three names proves that there is a break between chapters xii and xiii. . . . Why then is xii. 25 misplaced? The answer is that the author of Acts . . . when arranging his notes or his sources (he must have had the one or the other<sup>11</sup>), removed xii. 25 from its original context in order to preserve chronological sequence. The events recorded in xii. 1-24 occurred after the prophecy of Agabus and before the arrival of Barnabas and Saul at Jerusalem. Chronological order is thus maintained with the exception of the anticipatory relative clause in xi. 30, which is as natural in its place as is the similar anticipatory relative clause in xi. 28. The syntactical form of xii. 25 — so exactly corresponding with xxv. 13, the authority of the great MSS, and the meaning of the passage, unite to shew that this fifth instance may be added to the other four. . . . MSS shew no tendency to substitute an aorist for a future participle, except in cases which observe the narrow limits stated above.

The borrowing of aorist forms for the future is out of the question here,

and it is difficult to account for the presence of the aorist readings except on the supposition that the aorist is what the author wrote and that the future is an attempt on the part of copyists to eliminate the construction in favour of one with which they were more familiar. . . . So long as *ἀσπασάμενοι* in Acts xxv. 13 was regarded as an isolated phenomenon, Blass was justified in rejecting it; if the above view is accepted, there are eight parallel instances. Incidentally, also, two of the ten cases of 'primitive error' in Acts enumerated in [Westcott and Hort's] smaller edition, p. 585, disappear, and the authority of the great MSS is proportionately confirmed.

To the instances enumerated above one may be added from Amherst Papyri II, no. 41, dating from the second century before Christ:

*Διόδωρος τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῦ Σοκνοπαίου καὶ Ἰσίου Νεφορσείου χαίρειν. Πέπομφα τὸν παρ' ἐμοῦ Πετερμούθιν σφραγισάμενον τὸν θησαυρόν. Καλῶς οὖν ποήσετε συνπαραστάντες αὐτῷ ἕως ἂν ποήσῃται τὸν σφραγισμὸν καὶ συνπαρόντος τοῦ Λεσώνιος, κ. τ. λ.*

The context here fully justifies the translation of the editors, 'I have sent Petermouthis to seal the granary.' Considering the infrequency of this usage, it seems to be educated colloquial, that is, just what one may expect in notes not yet finally elaborated or revised by the compiler. This argument is of course

<sup>11</sup> In my opinion 'sources' and 'notes' come to the same thing when it is a question of arranging.



strengthened by the observation of Chambers concerning the relation between 11, 30 and 12, 25.

In view of such facts — and the evidence may be augmented considerably by research — it seems that the more strictly philological argument is favorable to the theory of a posthumous edition as set forth above.

#### NOTE ON THE CHARACTER OF PAUL

With regard to the character of Paul as represented by Luke, in the first place a good deal of exaggeration should be discounted. Wellhausen (*Abhandlungen*, Göttingen Academy, N.F., XV, 1914, p. 45) uses language which is too strong for his evidence when he accuses the Paul of Acts 21, 23 of "eine verlogene Probe schauspielerischer Selbstverleugnung." Windisch (*Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. II, p. 333) judges that "a personal friend could not possibly have represented Paul as denying his convictions in order to save his life." I think this a conclusion not justifiable on sound historical exegesis, and largely due to modern and Western standards (cf. above, p. 100, and my *Handelingen*, pp. 137 f.). But a good parallel is available. Plato was for the ancients as much a saint as was Paul for the author of Acts. Tatian, a typically Eastern popular philosopher, wrote of him (chapters 22 ff.):

Τοῦτο τοίνυν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μαθὼν ὁ Πλάτων, καὶ σφόδρα ἀρεσθεὶς τοῖς περὶ ἐνὸς θεοῦ εἰρημένοις, τοῦ μὲν ὀνόματος Μωυσέως διὰ τὸ ἕνα καὶ μόνον θεὸν διδάσκειν μνημονεύσαι παρ' Ἀθηναίοις οὐκ ἀσφαλὲς ἡγήετο, δεδιὼς τὸν Ἀρεῖον Πάγον, τὸ δὲ καλῶς εἰρημένον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ οὐχ ὡς μαθὼν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἑαυτοῦ δόξαν ἐν τῷ ἐσπουδασμένῳ αὐτοῦ λόγῳ Τιμαίῳ ἐν ᾧ καὶ θεολογεῖν ἐπιχειρεῖ, τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ περὶ θεοῦ Μωυσῆς γέγραπεν.

Ἐνταῦθα ὁ Πλάτων, τοὺς τὴν πολυθεότητα ἀσπαζομένους δεδιὼς, ἐναντία ἑαυτῷ τὸν κατ' αὐτὸν δημιουργὸν εἰσάγει λέγοντα . . .

Καὶ οὐ μόνον περὶ αὐτῶν (sc. τῶν θεῶν) ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῆς ὕλης . . . ἐκὼν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ὁ Πλάτων, τοὺς τὴν πολυθεότητα ἀσπαζομένους δεδιὼς, ἀλλόκοτα περὶ θεῶν διεξιέναι φαίνεται.

Ὁ Πλάτων τὴν ἡμέραν ὀνομάζει χρόνον, ἵνα μὴ δόξη ἡμέρας μεμνημένος, ὡς πάντῃ τοῖς Μωυσέως ἐπόμενος ῥητοῖς παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις κατηγορεῖσθαι.

Still stronger is Tatian's language in chapter 20, Πλάτων δὲ ἀποδεξάμενος μὲν, ὡς ἔοικεν, τὴν περὶ ἑνὸς καὶ μόνου θεοῦ Μωυσέως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προφητῶν διδασκαλίαν, ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ γενόμενος, ἔγνω, διὰ δὲ τὰ συμβεβηκότα Σωκράτει δεδιὼς . . . φόβῳ τοῦ κωνείου ποικίλον τινα καὶ ἐσχηματισμένον τὸν περὶ θεῶν γυμνάζει λόγον.

Now Tatian is quite serious, at least on the subject of Plato, and far from meaning to irritate his audience with paradoxes. He is saving Plato's reputation as a monotheist, which was what his time required, and this method of defending him before a mixed audience was apparently not of a nature to damage Tatian's main point, the dependence of Plato on Moses.

Moreover, it should not be forgotten that Acts does not make Paul take the course which it ascribes to him from fear for his life. That is put out of the question by 21, 13 καὶ ἀποθανεῖν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐτοίμως ἔχω ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου. Leaving aside the question of how far Paul may have been disavowing his own tenets, here also the real difficulties which were behind the Antioch-Jerusalem agreement are in the case. Among the ἅγιοι at Jerusalem a large proportion of chauvinist Jews were now present. The situation had changed; nine years later we have the cataclysm of the Great War. James and the others are evidently so much pressed by circumstances that they sacrifice the obvious exigencies of Eastern politeness and circumlocution, and immediately urge on their guest the seriousness of the situation. In putting the matter in this way, and referring to the collection only by way of allusion in 24, 17, Luke has vividly sketched the impasse in which Paul found himself, together with his hosts. And Romans 15, 31 shows that this did not come unexpectedly to Paul himself. Now the expedient to which Paul consented had the illustrious precedent of King Herod Agrippa I, whose past was still more fit to rouse the suspicions of pious Jews. Of course the contradiction between violent expressions like those of Gal. 1, 13 f.; 5, 2-4, and this course should be recognized. It is not altogether removed by the contrary confessions of 1 Cor. 9, 20 and the like. But Galatians was written before the Antioch-Jerusalem agreement. It is, moreover, followed by 16, 3 f. Yet there is here something of the Levantine mind which we Westerners cannot

easily see through Eastern spectacles. The principal difference (cf. W. Haas, *Die Seele des Orients*, Jena, 1916), as far as it regards this case, lies in the exculpating influence of circumstances, which we never acknowledge to such a degree as do Eastern people. We are not so ready to see in circumstances the voice of God. We have a conscience, and that is a different thing from the far less intuitive and more intellectually and externally acting *συνείδησις* of the ancients. Moreover, the situation in which the leaders at Jerusalem found themselves was exceedingly difficult, and it was evidently Paul's duty not to aggravate it, since he was there by his own decision and not at their bidding. It would have been much the simpler course, and the most advantageous one for the ideals of the community, which they had to guard, if they had flatly disavowed Paul. That to the view of the author of Acts this is the background of Paul's action, is evident from the curt reference to the Jerusalem-Antioch agreement: *περὶ δὲ τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἐθνῶν ἡμεῖς ἐπεστείλαμεν κρίναντες φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτοὺς τό τε εἰδωλόθυτον καὶ αἷμα καὶ πνικτὸν καὶ πορνείαν*. That is put by Luke as final and decisive. Whatever may have been the deviations of Paul from this practice in far-away countries and communities, whose communion with the original Jerusalem ἄγιοι might be disavowed if need be, once here Paul had not the right to play fast and loose with an agreement that on Jewish soil was fundamental for the position and the future of the original community. Both parties, moreover, were convinced that the Parousia was imminent. In this light even Paul, who after all was a Jew, may have felt that his principles were perhaps too incisively put in Gal. 3, 24 f. He did not need to abandon his conviction that law was a pedagogic and temporary means in the hand of God, for he never had claimed that Jews should abandon their privilege of being God's own people. The fact of the *μυριάδες*, *πάντες* *ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου*, must have impressed him as being in itself an indication of the *βουλὴ τοῦ θεοῦ*, perhaps difficult to explain, but at all events not to be resisted by human obstinacy and for personal reasons, especially since the Parousia would bring within a few years, or perhaps months, the final decision by the supreme authority of the Lord Jesus. It seems to me necessary,

particularly with reference to 21, 25, to view the whole situation not from the side of Paul (still less from that of theories of Paulinism), but from the Palestinian point of view, as far as this is embodied in Acts xv. This is evidently the crucial point from which the author has treated his notes on Paul. According to Eastern standards the character of Paul emerges clean and whole from this situation. Perhaps it may be possible for us, too, at least to feel some doubts about the wisdom and the charity of the course which our less pliable habits would have prescribed to us.





# ANCESTOR WORSHIP IN AFRICA

JAMES THAYER ADDISON

EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, CAMBRIDGE

EVIDENCE for the existence of ancestor worship among the uncivilized peoples of Africa is varied and abundant.<sup>1</sup> Outside the limited range of Mohammedan and Christian influence, there are few tribes whose religion has been reported with any care that do not appear to practice ancestor worship in some form. Without any attempt to provide a complete volume of testimony, and with the purpose only to indicate the wide range and diversity of these practices, we shall review geographically a portion of the facts available, passing across the map somewhat irregularly from northwest to southeast.

Among the natives of French Guinea the numerous spirits worshipped include the spirits of ancestors, who are regarded as the protectors of the family. Chief among them is the eponymous first ancestor, who has the power of making rain and whose image is concealed in every hut. Some of the ancestral spirits are regarded as good, some as evil. The latter are especially dreaded, and sacrifices are readily offered to them to persuade them to keep away. The prevailing belief is that the spirits of the deceased need the nourishment given them by the living, although in certain places the natives refuse them any sort of tribute.<sup>2</sup>

Similar rites and beliefs are found among the Vei of Liberia. The spirits of the dead have the power to do evil to the individual and the tribe, especially if provision is not made for their need of food and clothes. The first duty, therefore, of the members of the tribe is to protect themselves against these spirits

<sup>1</sup> The authorities quoted for the facts which follow include government officials, missionaries, anthropologists, and travellers. Though their testimony is of unequal value, most of them are first-hand observers, and the majority of their works are of fairly recent date. The spelling of tribal names will not satisfy everyone; but there is no method of spelling these names which does satisfy everyone.

<sup>2</sup> André Arcin, *La Guinée Française*, Paris, 1907, pp. 395 f.

by satisfying their wants. In all the Vei towns there are annual or semi-annual sacrifices to the recently deceased, during which the graves are visited, with offerings of rice and rum and songs chanted in honor of the dead.<sup>3</sup>

The natives of Segu, along the upper Niger, "believe in the existence of the shades of the dead; they venerate them and seek by certain practices to conciliate them."<sup>4</sup> The Bambara generally sacrifice to the dead on the threshold of the house, pouring the blood on the two side-walls of the entrance — an indication that the souls of the dead dwell especially in the threshold.<sup>5</sup> Some two or three hundred miles to the east, in the territory of the Yatenga and of the Mossi tribes, the ancestors rank first among the spirits worshipped. The chief feast of the year is sacred to them, and at all other religious festivities, as well, they receive sacrifices. Apart from the regular feasts, offerings are likewise made to ancestors, particularly when they appear in dreams as an indication of their wants, or when someone is sick and their aid is sought to secure recovery.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, "the foundation of their religion seems to consist in a continual preoccupation with the subject of an ever possible intervention of deceased ancestors in the existence of the living."<sup>7</sup>

In the Bontuku region, northeast of the Ivory Coast, the Abrons sacrifice to ancestors at two annual feasts.<sup>8</sup> Similar sacrifices are more frequent among the Koulangos, where special offerings to ancestors are made at times of birth and marriage, to secure good crops, etc.<sup>9</sup>

In Ashanti and Dahomey, two of the chief states of Guinea, the ghosts of the dead are regarded as tutelary spirits.<sup>10</sup> It is by the royal families of these petty kingdoms that ancestor worship has been specially developed. At the Dahomey court there have been annual sacrifices by the kings upon the graves

<sup>3</sup> G. W. Ellis, *Negro Culture in West Africa*, New York, 1914, pp. 86 f.

<sup>4</sup> G. Jaime, *De Koulikoro à Tombouctou*, Paris, 1894, p. 328.

<sup>5</sup> J. G. Frazer, *Folk-lore in the Old Testament*, vol. III, London, 1918, p. 17.

<sup>6</sup> L. Tauxier, *Le Noir du Yatenga*, Paris, 1917, p. 373.

<sup>7</sup> Lucien Marc, *Le Pays Mossi*, Paris, 1909, pp. 155 f.

<sup>8</sup> L. Tauxier, *Le Noir de Bondoukou*, Paris, 1921, p. 355.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 172 f.

<sup>10</sup> C. H. Toy, *Introduction to the History of Religions*, Boston, 1913, p. 154.

of former kings, who are thereby induced to lend their aid in time of war. Such sacrifices have involved the slaughter not only of sheep and fowls but also of men.<sup>11</sup> The scenes witnessed at these anniversary feasts of the dead "rivalled in horror those held in honor of the Aztec gods."<sup>12</sup> A further and less gory practice of the Dahomey royal family is to appoint some female official to represent each deceased monarch on ceremonial occasions, a custom which we may note as an interesting parallel to the "personator" of ancient China. The devotion to ancestors in Dahomey, however, is not limited to the kings alone, for members of the upper classes are accustomed to place in their houses the skulls of those who have been dead for more than a few years and to appeal to them for advice and assistance.<sup>13</sup>

The Yoruba, who live just to the east of Dahomey, maintain in their houses a family worship of deceased ancestors, both male and female.<sup>14</sup> Their belief in the power of the dead over the living is enhanced by the frequent custom of burying the dead in the houses, and expresses itself both in prayers for protection and in consultation of the dead upon affairs of importance.<sup>15</sup>

The tribes of the Gold Coast and Slave Coast look to the dead as protectors of the family who are interested in the affairs of this world and in the fortunes of their descendants; and appeals for aid, accompanied by offerings, are sometimes made to the spirits of such ancestors as are not too remote.<sup>16</sup> Nevertheless, as Ellis points out in his noted work on the Ewe-speaking peoples, the dead, though commonly regarded as guardians, are not considered to be gods. They are in a category

<sup>11</sup> A. B. Ellis, *The Ewe-speaking Peoples of the Slave Coast*, London, 1890, pp. 111 f.

<sup>12</sup> A. H. Keane, *Man, Past and Present*, Cambridge, 1899, p. 58.

<sup>13</sup> A. B. Ellis, *op. cit.*, pp. 110 f.

<sup>14</sup> A. B. Ellis, *The Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, London, 1894, p. 137; R. E. Dennett, *At the Back of the Black Man's Mind*, London, 1906, pp. 245 f., quoting James Johnson's Yoruba Heathenism.

<sup>15</sup> R. Campbell, *A Pilgrimage to my Motherland*, London, 1861, pp. 63 f.; see also Toy, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

<sup>16</sup> Ellis, *Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, pp. 24 f., 109; B. Cruickshank, *Eighteen Years on the Gold Coast of Africa*, London, 1853, vol. II, p. 135.



entirely different from that of gods or nature-spirits, who must constantly be propitiated to avert their ill-will, and who are objects of worship not only for the living but for the dead themselves. Furthermore the nature gods are not deified dead men, and ancestral ghosts seldom if ever develop into nature-spirits.<sup>17</sup>

Of the inhabitants of the plateau of Bandiagara in south-central Nigeria it is recorded that an altar to ancestors is placed in the family home, upon which sacrifices are offered during a certain period after death when the soul hovers between the grave and the home.<sup>18</sup>

Somewhat fuller evidence is available for the general area of both the Edo-speaking peoples and the Ibo-speaking peoples of Nigeria. Among the former every house has its shrine and its household worship, which includes the worship of ancestors. The ancestors are represented sometimes by long wooden staves carved with decorations, sometimes by heads of wood or bronze. Annual celebrations take place, usually on the anniversary of the death. The sacrifices, offered by all the sons or by the eldest son, "seem to be looked upon rather as a means of keeping away sickness or other misfortune than as a duty imposed by pious regard."<sup>19</sup> Among the Ibo-speaking peoples similar practices are found. Here too the ancestors are represented by long staves. Since their spirits are present at feasts, a handful of food is usually thrown to them. Regular sacrifices occur in the seventh or eighth month, and special sacrifices on such occasions as a birth in the family.<sup>20</sup>

The principal features of the religion of the Ekoi of southern Nigeria are reported to be the cult of nature spirits and of ancestors. One of their head priests is quoted as saying, "I do not know if ghosts can do harm to the living, but I always sacrifice yams and plantains to my father's spirit, so that I may

<sup>17</sup> Ellis, *Yoruba-speaking Peoples*, pp. 24 f., 102-105.

<sup>18</sup> Louis Desplagnes, *Le Plateau Central Nigérien*, Paris, 1907, pp. 261 f.

<sup>19</sup> N. W. Thomas, *Anthropological Report on the Edo-speaking Peoples of Nigeria*, Pt. I, London, 1910, pp. 24, 37 f., 78.

<sup>20</sup> N. W. Thomas, *Anthropological Report on the Ibo-speaking Peoples of Nigeria*, Pt. I, London, 1913, pp. 34 f.

not fall sick, and to ask him to protect my farms. About once a year, too . . . I sacrifice to my mother, for we know that ghosts are hungry just as we are.”<sup>21</sup>

In the adjacent territory of Cameroon the worship of the dead is prevalent,<sup>22</sup> and among certain tribes (such as the Tikar) constitutes the most important and influential factor in religion. The Tikar, in contrast with many other tribes, believe that the ghosts of evil men can work no harm to the living. The ghosts of the good, however, can do good to their surviving relatives and friends, but have no power to punish. These good ghosts, preferably the spirits of deceased fathers, are frequently called upon for protection.<sup>23</sup>

At least two tribes in Gabun — the Fang<sup>24</sup> and the Mpongwe — are described as ancestor-worshippers. The Mpongwe regard the dead as possessing increased powers; they present to them offerings of food and drink, and call upon them in time of trouble.<sup>25</sup>

The Bavili of Loango, near the coast further south, believe that the ghosts of important persons remain active and powerful. They continue to share in the tribal life, and manifest their activity by helping or punishing through control over the wind, the crops, etc.<sup>26</sup>

In the northwest part of the Belgian Congo the Bangala<sup>27</sup> are accustomed to build huts above the tombs of deceased fathers and there to make offerings of fruit and vegetables. The *mongoli*, or ancestral spirits, watch over the family. They inhabit the forests and rivers, and visit the villages in animal form

<sup>21</sup> P. A. Talbot, *In the Shadow of the Bush*, London, 1912, pp. 13, 232 f. For notes on ancestor worship along the Lower Niger, see also A. G. Leonard, *The Lower Niger and its Tribes*, London, 1906, pp. 67, 89, 434.

<sup>22</sup> E. Zintgraff, *Nord-Kamerun*, Berlin, 1895, p. 221; A. Seidel, *Deutsch-Kamerun*, Berlin, 1906, pp. 205 f.

<sup>23</sup> F. and M. P. Thorbecke, *Im Hochland von Mittel-Kamerun*, Pt. III, Hamburg, 1919, pp. 83 f.

<sup>24</sup> A. L. Cureau, *Savage Man in Central Africa* (translated), London, 1915, pp. 282 f.

<sup>25</sup> J. L. Wilson, *Western Africa*, New York, 1856, pp. 338, 392 ff.; P. Barret, *L'Afrique Occidentale*, vol. II, Paris, 1888, pp. 193 f.

<sup>26</sup> A. Le Roy, *The Religion of the Primitives* (translated), New York, 1922, p. 105.

<sup>27</sup> C. Van Overbergh, *Les Bangala*, Brussels, 1907, p. 253.

to receive wine and food. Prayers and sacrifice are offered at irregular intervals by the favorite son to gain the good-will of father or grandfather. There is no tendance of ancestors, however, beyond the fourth generation.<sup>28</sup>

Similar practices are related of other Congo peoples, the Mayumbe<sup>29</sup> and the Waregga.<sup>30</sup> Of the Congo natives in general Claridge writes, "The Congolese pray to the dead, praise the dead, and sacrifice to the dead. . . . The premise is that the dead can help the living, that they can hear prayer, that they have the means and the disposition to grant their petitions."<sup>31</sup>

Uganda, Kenya (former "British East Africa"), and Tanganyika Territory (former "German East Africa") offer especially abundant evidence of ancestor worship.

The religion of the Bahima of Ankole consists chiefly in maintaining helpful relations with the spirits of departed relatives by means of continual offerings.<sup>32</sup> Each home has its shrine for a family ghost.<sup>33</sup> For the Banyankole the really important supernatural beings are the ghosts. All classes have shrines for their family ghosts; and it is to these spirits rather than to the great gods that the people turn for help, with offerings and prayers.<sup>34</sup> The Banyoro have the custom of presenting a new-born child to the ancestral spirits with prayers requesting long life and riches.<sup>35</sup> When the king of the tribe falls sick, he attributes it to the influence of an ancestral ghost and sends an offering to the grave;<sup>36</sup> and the people as a whole stand in constant awe of the spirits of the departed, particularly of those who were powerful in life.<sup>37</sup> The Lango, a Nilotic tribe of Uganda, maintain shrines where offerings are presented

<sup>28</sup> E. S. Hartland, *Ritual and Belief*, London, 1914, p. 148; J. H. Weeks, *Among Congo Cannibals*, London, 1913, pp. 261, 268.

<sup>29</sup> C. Van Overbergh, *Les Mayombe*, Brussels, 1907, p. 289.

<sup>30</sup> Delhaise, *Les Warega*, Brussels, 1909, p. 207.

<sup>31</sup> G. C. Claridge, *Wild Bush Tribes of Tropical Africa*, London, 1922, pp. 279, 284.

<sup>32</sup> J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 3d ed., Pt. IV, vol. II, London, 1911-15, pp. 190 f.

<sup>33</sup> J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu*, Cambridge, 1915, p. 132.

<sup>34</sup> J. Roscoe, *The Banyankole*, Cambridge, 1923, p. 25.

<sup>35</sup> H. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. II, London, 1902, p. 587.

<sup>36</sup> J. Roscoe, *The Northern Bantu*, p. 94.

<sup>37</sup> J. Roscoe, *The Bakitara or Banyoro*, Cambridge, 1923, p. 41.

to ancestral spirits.<sup>38</sup> The ghosts of the dead are believed by the Basoga to help or hinder in sickness and in prosperity, and to have power over birth and death. They receive in consequence more fear and more attention than the gods. "The belief in ghosts and the propitiation of them are the chief features of their most constant and regular acts of worship."<sup>39</sup> The worship of the Bateso is almost entirely confined to ghosts of the dead.<sup>40</sup> The Wawanga<sup>41</sup> and the Bagesu in the neighborhood of Mount Elgon frequently place near the doorways of their houses large stones where the spirits of male ancestors may rest. The Bagesu regard these ghosts as the particular guardians of children, and food and drink are regularly set before them with such words as "Be kind to the children. Do them no harm."<sup>42</sup> The Kavirondo, whose chief form of religion is the worship of the dead,<sup>43</sup> have the same practice of setting up stones, upon which libations of goat's blood are poured. They sometimes cut a small door at the back of the dwelling to assist the passage in and out of good ancestral spirits. But the only spirits who receive attention are those of men who were important in their lifetime.<sup>44</sup>

In the large tribe of the Baganda the most venerated spirits were probably those of departed relatives, whose power for good or evil was incalculable. The ghosts were thought to have many of the wants and emotions of the living. Subject to cold and thirst (although not, curiously enough, to hunger), they could be pleased by kindness or angered by neglect. Hence it was the constant concern of the living to care for their interests and thus to avoid the retaliation that might bring sickness and death in the clan. The majority of the ghosts, however, if treated well, were kindly disposed to assist the members of their own clan; and frequent offerings of beer or clothing at

<sup>38</sup> J. H. Driberg, *The Lango*, London, 1923, p. 231.

<sup>39</sup> Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, p. 245.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 273.

<sup>41</sup> Frazer, *Folk-lore in the Old Testament*, vol. III, p. 263.

<sup>42</sup> Roscoe, *Northern Bantu*, p. 180.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 291; K. H. Dundas in *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute*, vol. XLIII, p. 45.

<sup>44</sup> Johnston, *Uganda Protectorate*, vol. II, p. 752.



the small shrines near the graves were commonly thought to result in increase of wealth and fertility for the family.<sup>45</sup>

The Suk of Kenya are one of the numerous African peoples who believe that a man's spirit passes at death into a snake. The presence of a snake in the house indicates that some ancestor is hungry, and caution suggests that milk and meat should be promptly offered to it.<sup>46</sup> A similiar belief is found among the Akikuyu, who ascribe all the ordinary ills of life to the action of the spirits of the departed.<sup>47</sup> Other tribes who look upon serpents as incarnating ancestral spirits include the Zulus, Thonga, Angoni, Wabondei, Masai, Nandi, and Dinkas.<sup>48</sup> The Wakamba of Kenya believe themselves surrounded by innumerable ancestral spirits (*aiimu*) who manifest themselves in many ways and are often regarded as inhabiting wild fig-trees. Huts are built at the foot of these trees, and periodical sacrifices offered there. The first-fruits are always presented to the *aiimu* before any crop can be eaten. There prevails also an unusual belief that every married woman is not only the wife of a living man but also of some departed ancestor. Her fertility depends on the latter as well as on the former.<sup>49</sup> The belief in ancestral spirits is the predominating spiritual factor in the minds of the great majority of the people. The reality and closeness of this influence upon the daily life of the native can hardly be exaggerated.<sup>50</sup> The religious ideas of the Wagirama, a tribe near Mombasa, are mainly connected with ancestor worship. "Individuals worship the shades of their immediate ancestors or elder relatives; and the *k'omas* (souls?) of the whole nation are worshipped on public occasions. . . . Sacrifices are often made at the graves with a little flour and water poured into a coconut shell let into the ground, the fowls and other

<sup>45</sup> J. Roscoe, *The Baganda*, London, 1911, pp. 273-288.

<sup>46</sup> M. W. H. Beech, *The Suk*, Oxford, 1911, p. 20.

<sup>47</sup> W. S. and K. Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People*, London, 1910, p. 227; Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Pt. IV, vol. I, pp. 82 f.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> C. W. Hobley, *Ethnology of A-Kamba*, Cambridge, 1910, pp. 85 f.; Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Pt. V, vol. II, p. 113; Pt. I, vol. II, p. 317.

<sup>50</sup> C. W. Hobley, *Bantu Beliefs and Magic*, London, 1922, pp. 22, 27 ff.; Hobley, *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute*, vol. XLI, p. 432.

victims being so killed that the blood shall trickle into the grave. At the offering the dead are called by name to come and partake and bring their friends with them.”<sup>51</sup> Prayers and sacrifices are offered in time of disease, of marriage, birth, and death, and at seedtime and harvest.<sup>52</sup>

The same sort of testimony is forthcoming from investigators in Tanganyika Territory (former “German East Africa”). On its northeast borders, near Lake Kivu, the Bañarwanda look upon the souls even of the best of the departed as not always kind. If they are not to cause calamities they must be continually propitiated with offerings.<sup>53</sup> Certain tribes north of Lake Tanganyika, in Ruanda, built little grass huts for their ancestors, where the head of the family makes offerings of meat and beer.<sup>54</sup> One member of a neighboring tribe is reported as saying: “If we want to go on a journey, or need rain or any other thing, we bring food here [to the spirit-hut] to show our ancestors we really want assistance; and they help us.”<sup>55</sup> Another native, belonging to the Wachaga near Mount Kilimanjaro, slaughtered a wether at a certain spot and splashed its blood about. “My grandfather lived up here,” he explained, “and since I now visit his old dwelling-place so often, I must just once bring his spirit something to eat. Otherwise he would be angry with me.”<sup>56</sup> His tribe were accustomed to offer these sacrifices of blood in order to obtain children, at the time of circumcision, and eight days after a death. At these times prayers were addressed to the ancestral spirits with invitations to eat.<sup>57</sup> There is evidence also that ancestor worship plays an equally important part in the religion of many other tribes of this region, such as the Masai,<sup>58</sup> the Wambugwe,<sup>59</sup> the San-

<sup>51</sup> A. H. Keane, *op. cit.*, pp. 95 f.

<sup>52</sup> Le Roy, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

<sup>53</sup> Hartland, *op. cit.*, p. 264.

<sup>54</sup> J. Czekanowski, in *Wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse der Deutschen Zentral-Afrika-Expedition 1907-1908*, vol. VI, Leipzig, 1917, p. 298; H. Meyer, *Die Barundi*, Leipzig, 1916, pp. 135 f.

<sup>55</sup> A. J. Swann, *Fighting the Slave-Hunters in Central Africa*, London, 1910, p. 208.

<sup>56</sup> G. Volkens, *Der Kilimandscharo*, Berlin, 1897, p. 254.

<sup>57</sup> Frazer, *Folk-lore in the Old Testament*, vol. II, pp. 16 f.; cf. P. E. Meyer, in *Anthropos*, vol. XII-XIII, pp. 190 f.

<sup>58</sup> S. L. Hinde, *The Last of the Masai*, London, 1901, pp. 101 f.

<sup>59</sup> O. Baumann, *Durch Massailand zur Nilquelle*, Berlin, 1894, pp. 187, 193.

dawi,<sup>59a</sup> and the Wabondei.<sup>60</sup> The Sandawi offer beer, cattle, and sheep to the souls of their ancestors, with prayers for rain.<sup>61</sup> Practically all the worship of the Wahehe is concerned with the spirits of the dead, who can control the weather, send disease, and otherwise wield a powerful influence on the course of events. Prayers and sacrifices are offered to them on their graves in time of war or sickness or on the eve of a journey.<sup>62</sup> The natives in the region of Newala, on the southern border of Tanganyika Territory, believe that deceased ancestors inhabit certain trees, before which they place food and drink and to which they address their petitions. A typical prayer is to this effect: "I have . . . brought you meal and beer. You, my ancestor, know that we are going to war against our enemies. . . . We are to march tomorrow; let no bullet strike me, no arrow and no spear."<sup>63</sup> To multiply the number of these obscure tribal names would make no clearer the wide extent of ancestor worship in this area; and we may conclude our survey of this particular territory by noting that offerings and prayers to ancestors have been remarked by observers among the Konde peoples (just north of Lake Nyassa), and among the Wabena and the Manganja.<sup>64</sup>

Westward, in Northeast Rhodesia, the Wanyamwanga are accustomed to offer to the ancestral spirits the first beer and flour made from the new harvest. With the invitation to the spirits to partake go thanksgiving for the harvest and petitions to avert illness and to maintain peace.<sup>65</sup> One of the two classes of spirits worshipped by the A-Wemba are the *mipashi*, or ancestral spirits. Of these there are two main classes — first, the spirits of departed chiefs, worshipped publicly by all the tribe, and secondly, the domestic spirits worshipped privately by the head of each family, who acts as priest for the other

<sup>59a</sup> O. Baumann, *Durch Massailand zur Nilquelle*, Berlin, 1894, pp. 187, 193.

<sup>60</sup> O. Baumann, *Usambara*, Berlin, 1891, pp. 141 f.

<sup>61</sup> O. Dempwolff, *Die Sandawe*, Hamburg, 1916, pp. 141 f.

<sup>62</sup> Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Pt. IV, vol. II, pp. 188 f.

<sup>63</sup> K. Weule, *Native Life in East Africa* (translated), London, 1909, pp. 324 ff.

<sup>64</sup> F. Fülleborn, *Das Deutsche Njassa- und Ruwuma-Gebiet*, Berlin, 1906, pp. 151, 216, 498; cf. W. P. Johnson, *Nyasa, the Great Water*, Oxford, 1922, p. 118.

<sup>65</sup> Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Pt. V, vol. II, p. 112.

members. Sacrifices of a sheep, a goat, or a fowl are made. While the spirit receives the blood poured out on the ground, the members of the family partake of the flesh. This cult of his nearest deceased relatives is regarded as the chief religious duty of every man in the tribe. The ancestral spirits are on the whole beneficent, and their aid is invoked on special occasions, such as harvesting or travelling.<sup>66</sup> The Tumbuka of the Nyasaland Protectorate are wont to conclude the year of mourning for the deceased with a great feast for the friends and relatives and a procession to the grave. There beer is poured out, with the words: "We have come to bring you . . . back to the village. Come and visit your family. See, I give you this . . . that you may drink."<sup>67</sup> Tiny huts are prepared as dwellings for ancestral spirits and offerings are there presented.<sup>68</sup> Other tribes of Nyassaland, including the Angoni and the Yao, believe that the dead have power to help or hinder their surviving relatives, and consequently propitiate them with sacrifices and call to them for help.<sup>69</sup> Duff Macdonald has written a full account of the religion of the tribes of this area. According to his observations, "the spirits of the dead are the gods of the living";<sup>70</sup> "the spirit of every deceased man and woman, with the solitary exception of wizards and witches, becomes an object of homage."<sup>71</sup> As a matter of practice, however, the community concentrates its attention on the immediate ancestor of the village chief, to whom, indeed, most of the inhabitants are either related or assumed to be so. But the individual is still at liberty to approach with prayer and sacrifice the spirits of his own forefathers.<sup>72</sup> Writing of the natives of Manica and Sofala in southern Mozambique (Portuguese East Africa) R. C. F. Maugham says: "The native's reverence for . . . the efficacy of propitiating the spirits of the dead . . . has a pro-

<sup>66</sup> C. Gouldsbury and H. Sheane, *The Great Plateau of Northern Rhodesia*, London, 1911, pp. 82 ff.

<sup>67</sup> D. Fraser, *Winning a Primitive People*, New York, 1914, p. 160.

<sup>68</sup> Frazer, *Folk-lore in the Old Testament*, vol. III, p. 263.

<sup>69</sup> D. Fraser, *op. cit.*, pp. 126 f.; Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Pt. V, vol. II, p. 112; J. W. Jack, *Daybreak in Livingstonia*, New York, 1900, p. 260.

<sup>70</sup> Duff Macdonald, *Africana*, vol. I, London, 1882, p. 59.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 68.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. I, pp. 64 f.



found bearing upon his every action. More than anything, perhaps, the people fear the anger . . . of these spirits, and leave nothing undone to conciliate them. . . . Before any important undertaking the spirits are interrogated, and prayed to give some sign to indicate their views with regard to the matter at issue."<sup>73</sup> Among the Ba-Ila of northern Rhodesia the family divinities are the ghosts of father, grandfather, and other near relatives. They continue to take an interest in the welfare of those on earth and are never far away. The man and wife have different family divinities, the children inheriting the father's. The religious attitude, of trust and fear combined, is determined by the belief that the living and the dead depend on one another.<sup>74</sup> The Barotse, along the upper Zambesi, have at least one form of ancestor worship in their sacrifices at the tombs of the royal ancestors. As one of their chiefs put it, after conversion to Christianity, "Let us talk no more about our ancestors; they are no gods."<sup>75</sup> Another tribe of the Upper Zambesi, the A-Maravi, or Zimbabwé, attribute to the spirits of the dead all the good and ill that befall them, and offer to the deceased each year the first-fruits of all produce.<sup>76</sup> The Matabeles, their chief acting as priest, sacrifice oxen to their ancestral spirits in order to bring rain.<sup>77</sup>

In Southwest Africa (former "German Southwest Africa") two of the leading tribes are the Ovampo and the Herero. Among the former a conspicuous place is assigned to the worship of the spirits of the dead, who are believed to exercise a powerful influence over the living. The soul of an ordinary dead man can affect only the members of his own family,<sup>78</sup> but the spirits of dead chiefs can give or withhold rain. Hence great respect is paid to them and a thanksgiving festival held in their honor at the close of the harvest season.<sup>79</sup> Among the Herero,

<sup>73</sup> R. C. F. Maugham, *Portuguese East Africa*, London, 1906, pp. 280 f.

<sup>74</sup> E. W. Smith and A. M. Dale, *The Ila-speaking Peoples of Northern Rhodesia*, vol. II, London, 1920, pp. 124, 165-174.

<sup>75</sup> C. W. Mackintosh, *Coillard of the Zambesi*, London, 1907, pp. 339, 431; F. Coillard, *Sur le Haut-Zambèze*, Paris, 1898, pp. 190, 196.

<sup>76</sup> Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Pt. V, vol. II, p. 111.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, Pt. I, vol. I, p. 352.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, Pt. IV, vol. II, p. 188.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, Pt. V, vol. II, p. 110.

too, ancestral spirits are feared and propitiated with offerings.<sup>80</sup> So constant is the dread of their power to inflict misfortune that the chief aim of religion is to appease them. The chief seat of this worship is the family hearth, near which sacred sticks are kept to represent individual ancestors of the paternal clan. Here the newborn child is brought to be introduced to the spirits and receive a name, and here the bride is conducted at marriage, that sacrifices may be made.<sup>81</sup> South of the Herero, in Namaqualand, the veneration of famous ancestors is prominent in the native religion.<sup>82</sup> The Bechuana, too, are ancestor-worshippers. "Their highest . . . act of worship . . . is to sacrifice a sheep at the grave of a deceased ancestor, whose help is invoked by prayer."<sup>83</sup> They ascribe changes of weather to the influence of deceased members of the tribe.<sup>84</sup> The Bankuma in the northeastern part of the Transvaal, make offerings to ancestors with such prayers as these: "O you, our former fathers and mothers, . . . here is the ox you want; eat it, sharing it with our ancestors who died both before and after you. . . . Give us life, give good things to us and our children."<sup>85</sup> The religion of the Baronga, the natives of Delagoa Bay, is chiefly concerned with the spirits of their ancestors. The leading divinities are the ancestors of the reigning chief, who, especially in times of national trouble, are worshipped in the forest cemeteries by appointed priests. But each family has likewise its own ancestors, at whose worship the father of the family officiates. At deaths and at marriages the blessing of these spirits is invoked upon the dead or upon the new arrival in the family.<sup>86</sup> The neighboring Thonga have similar beliefs and practices. The tribal ancestors are held responsible for the fertility of the soil, and first-fruits are sacrificed to them. The family, too, maintain the cult of their own ancestors, at which the eldest member of the family officiates. Not only are

<sup>80</sup> Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Pt. IV, vol. II, p. 186.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, Pt. I, vol. II, pp. 221 f.

<sup>82</sup> G. Fritsch, *Die Eingeborenen Süd-Afrika's*, Breslau, 1872, p. 354.

<sup>83</sup> J. Mackenzie, *Day-Dawn in Dark Places*, London, 1884, p. 217.

<sup>84</sup> Hartland, *Ritual and Belief*, p. 175.

<sup>85</sup> L. Lévy-Bruhl, *La Mentalité primitive*, Paris, 1922, p. 82 and note.

<sup>86</sup> H. A. Junod, *Les Baronga*, Neuchâtel, 1898, pp. 381 ff.

the ancestors invoked at the time of marriage but also in case of disease, when divination has revealed the fact that some ancestral spirit is the cause.<sup>87</sup> In this tribe there are two sets of ancestors for each family—those on the father's and those on the mother's side.<sup>88</sup>

All the religious interests of the Zulus centre around the *amatongo*, or ancestral spirits. The tribe as a whole may worship the spirits of tribal ancestors or departed chiefs; but it is the deceased father, the most recently departed head of the house, to whom the cult of each family is addressed. The sphere of activity of these spirits could hardly be wider. Sickness is sent by the dead to indicate their want of food; victory in battle is the result of their aid; a successful harvest is due to their help; and they are able not only to speak to their descendants in dreams and omens, but to appear to them in the form of wasps or of serpents. Indeed, "the whole of Zulu life is based on their belief in the vivid interest taken by the . . . spirits of the dead in the affairs of the living."<sup>89</sup> The sacrifice of bullocks, accompanied by prayers, is the commonest form of offering. An indication that such offerings of food are prompted by the needs of the dead as well as by those of the living is afforded by the frequent use in prayer of the argument that if all their worshippers are allowed to die, the dead will have no village to enter and no food to eat but grasshoppers. The dead are supposed not only to suffer from human wants, but also to maintain their human characteristics. A kind father, for instance, will remain kind, and in his gentleness his descendants may continue to trust.<sup>90</sup>

Each family among the Basuto is supposed to be under the direct influence and protection of its ancestors; but the tribe as a whole worships the ancestors of the reigning chief. The spirits of the deceased interfere in the daily affairs of the living

<sup>87</sup> H. A. Junod, 'Bantu Heathen Prayers,' in *International Review of Missions*, vol. XI, no. 44, pp. 561-565; cf. H. A. Junod, *The Life of a South African Tribe*, vol. II, Neuchâtel, 1913, pp. 293, 344, 348 ff., 386.

<sup>88</sup> Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Pt. IV, vol. II, p. 181.

<sup>89</sup> J. A. Farrer, *Zululand and the Zulus*, London, 1879, p. 134.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 127-136; J. Shooter, *The Kafirs of Natal and the Zulu Country*, London, 1857, pp. 161 ff.; L. Grout, *Zulu-Land*, Philadelphia, 1864, pp. 137, 144.

and influence their destiny, and are therefore approached with prayer and sacrifice. Since every disease is attributed to them, divination by means of bones is employed to indicate whether it is the paternal or the maternal ancestors who are offended, and steps are then taken to present the necessary offerings.<sup>91</sup> In each family of the Hottentots the ancestors are considered almost as household gods. Prayers are made to them and gifts offered. But in order to be heard it is necessary for the worshippers to perform the ceremonies at the grave itself. One woman of the tribe is reported as saying, "If we are in trouble, we always go and pray at the graves of our grandparents and ancestors."<sup>92</sup>

The native tribes inhabiting the area now known as the Union of South Africa are frequently referred to in general as the Kafirs. Meaning merely 'infidel,' this name is not ethnologically correct, but it is commonly used to cover such tribes as the Zulus, Basutos, and other natives of southernmost Africa. Writing of "the essential Kafir," Kidd says: "We find the natives associating the spirits of their ancestors with some special animal, most commonly with a snake. . . . The ancestors do not live in the actual individual snakes, but in the genus. . . . When men are alive they love to be praised and flattered, fed and attended to; after death they want the very same things, for death does not change personality. Thus, after any calamity, or after the appearance of a snake in the kraal, or a vivid dream of some dead relation, the men will select an ox to coax the spirit into a good temper. . . . In time of drought, or sickness, or great trouble, there would be great searchings of heart as to which ancestor had been neglected. . . . The most important part of the whole matter seems to be the praising of the ancestral spirit. It is as important as the sacrifice."<sup>93</sup> "These spirits may be offended and made angry by neglect or otherwise . . . and may inflict punishment which the people dread, and seek to avert."<sup>94</sup> An

<sup>91</sup> E. Casalis, *Les Bassoutos*, Paris, 1859, pp. 257-264; J. Widdicombe, *Fourteen Years in Basutoland*, London, 1891, p. 60.

<sup>92</sup> A. de Quatrefages, *The Pygmies* (translated), New York, 1895, pp. 228 f.

<sup>93</sup> D. Kidd, *The Essential Kafir*, London, 1904, pp. 84-92.

<sup>94</sup> W. C. Holden, *The Past and Future of the Kaffir Races*, London, 1866, p. 298.



interesting piece of early testimony to the religion of this same group of tribes is offered in a work by two French missionaries, who preface their remarks with the quaint statement that "all the blacks whom we have known are atheists; it would nevertheless be not impossible to find among them some deists." Not quite content, however, with this sophisticated classification, they proceed to explain the local cult of ancestors, stating that these divinities correspond to the *manes* of the ancient pagans.<sup>95</sup>

Bantu is the name applied to the family of languages spoken by nearly all the peoples inhabiting the territory south of a certain irregular boundary, drawn between Cameroon and Zanzibar. Since the name is also applied to the peoples themselves, it covers a large number of the tribes to which we have referred above. One or two quotations concerning the Bantu in general will therefore serve to reinforce and to summarize the facts already presented. The religion of the whole Bantu family, says Frazer, appears to be mainly ancestor worship.<sup>96</sup> And, says Theal, "the religion of the Bantu was based upon the supposition of the existence of spirits that could interfere with the affairs of this world. These spirits were those of their ancestors and their deceased chiefs."<sup>97</sup> As Sir Harry Johnston puts it, "the essence of true Negro religion is ancestor worship."<sup>98</sup>

The tribes of Madagascar have long been noted as specially devoted to different forms of ancestor worship, all of which find analogies on the continent of Africa. The earliest evidence may be found in a number of interesting letters from Catholic missionaries written in the 17th century. Le Père Luis Mariano writes in 1616: The Malagasy "offer . . . sacrifices to the *manes* of their dead . . . to whom they render a cult like that

<sup>95</sup> T. Arbousset and F. Dumas, *Relation d'un voyage d'exploration*, etc., Paris, 1842, pp. 77, 469.

<sup>96</sup> Frazer, *Golden Bough*, Pt. IV, vol. II, p. 176.

<sup>97</sup> G. McC. Theal, *The Yellow and Dark-skinned People of Africa South of the Zambesi*, London, 1910, p. 183.

<sup>98</sup> H. H. Johnston, *Liberia*, vol. II, London, 1906, p. 1062; cf. Lévy-Bruhl, *op. cit.*, p. 81 and note; E. W. Smith, *The Religion of Lower Races*, New York, 1923, pp. 33-48.

which we accord to our saints." Again he says: "They imagine that they are at the mercy of the *manes* of their relatives, to whom they attribute all the good and evil which God sends them." And le Père d'Azevedo writes in 1617: The Malagasy "address their prayers and make their offerings to the souls of their dead relatives, who are their idols. . . . They invoke these dead in every circumstance, especially in difficult moments."<sup>99</sup> Fuller and more recent testimony is also available. From it we learn that the controlling religious belief of the Malagasy is in the power of departed spirits to control affairs in this world, and that therefore his first duty is to be on good terms with his deceased kinsfolk. Any calamity is a sure sign of the displeasure of these spirits, and much money is spent, in case of illness or other trouble, in sacrificing oxen at the tombs of the ancestors.<sup>100</sup> Private ceremonies, in which only the members of the family take part, are held in the corner of the house where the deceased was wont to sit. The prayers in use on such occasions may be summed up as follows: "Here I am, my ancestor; I come with my family to bring you a part of what is yours. Be favorable now, and grant to us what we ask."<sup>101</sup> Of more central importance, however, than this limited domestic cult is the royal ancestor worship, especially of the Sakalava and the Hova. The spirits of celebrated deceased chieftains are worshipped at their tombs as the gods of the community. These graves are sacred places confided to the care of especially appointed guardians, and there are performed extensive ceremonies — including a grand annual festival — to glorify the ancestors and to obtain from them blessings and rewards.<sup>102</sup>

<sup>99</sup> Collection des ouvrages anciens concernant Madagascar, vol. II, Paris, 1904, pp. 228, 233, 245.

<sup>100</sup> H. W. Little, *Madagascar, its History and People*, Edinburgh, 1884, pp. 83 ff.

<sup>101</sup> M. A. Leblond, *La Grande Ile de Madagascar*, Paris, 1907, pp. 227 f.

<sup>102</sup> H. Rusillon, *Un Culte dynastique avec évocation des morts*, Paris, 1912, pp. 43-60; J. Sibree, Jr., *The Great African Island*, London, 1880, pp. 226 f., 303.



## THE APOSTLES' CREED

KIRSOPP LAKE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

DURING the last three years there has been unusual activity in the study of the Apostles' Creed.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of the present article is to draw attention to the significance of the main points which have been recently discussed.

The beginning, chronologically at least, was an article by Karl Holl in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy for January, 1919, pp. 2 ff. This dealt in the main with the second part of the Apostles' Creed — the description of Jesus Christ, and gave an acute and convincing analysis of the Greek, showing that the statements are so arranged that Jesus is primarily described as 'His (God's) only begotten Son' and 'our Lord,' *υἰὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν*. This double description is then further defined by a correspondingly double use of the Greek article, which is twice repeated so as to bring out the relation of the words defined by it to what has been said already, *τὸν γεννηθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, τὸν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου σταυρωθέντα καὶ ταφέντα, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀναβάντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καθημένον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὃθεν ἔρχεται κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς*, so that 'born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary' explains 'the only begotten Son,' and the statements of the Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, and Future Coming define the nature of the Lordship of Jesus.

Two points to which Karl Holl drew attention, but on which he scarcely laid emphasis, were first, the close relationship between these statements about Jesus and the Lukan writings, and secondly, the probability that at some time these statements formed a separate document which may conveniently

<sup>1</sup> See also Professor Krüger's article in the *Harvard Theological Review* for October, 1921.



be referred to as the *κήρυγμα*. The relation of the Creed to the Lukan writings had struck me independently and I emphasized this point in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. II, pp. 202 ff. The separate nature of the statements about Jesus had also been previously noticed, but I do not think that much emphasis has ever been put upon them. Certainly in the passage just referred to I overlooked the point. It is obviously important to consider whether it is not the *κήρυγμα* rather than the complete *symbolum Romanum* which is related to the Lukan writings.

The second contribution was a further discussion of some of these points before the Berlin Academy in February, 1919, by A. von Harnack (*Sitzungsberichte*, pp. 112 ff.), who, assuming that the *κήρυγμα* could be taken out and put aside as a separate entity, analyzed what remained after this dissection and emphasized its symmetrical composition, showing that it was originally three clauses, each again divided into three. The result was very convincing, though Harnack had some difficulty with the last clause.

The third contribution, also in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy for 1919, pp. 269 ff., was made by Hans Lietzmann, who pointed out the existence of early forms of the Creed which did not contain the *κήρυγμα*. Especially interesting is the form found in the papyrus of Der-Balyzeh, which confirms the conclusions already reached by Harnack, and justifies his treatment of the last clause.

Fuller than any of these contributions in the *Sitzungsberichte* is the monograph of Johannes Haussleiter, *Trinitarischer Glaube und Christusbekenntnis*, in the "Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie," xxi, 4, published in 1920. He has assembled in this monograph the evidence for the existence of the trinitarian formula contained in the Apostles' Creed and the *κήρυγμα* about Jesus as separate entities, reaching the theory that the combination of the two in the form found in the present Apostles' Creed was made in Rome, probably in the time of Zephyrinus and Callistus. He makes out a strong case, though the evidence which he produces is naturally not all of equal value, and some which he puts in the foreground, such as the

evidence of the *Liber Diurnus* of the popes, might be relegated to a secondary position.

But Haussleiter's contribution was not the end of the series. Lietzmann pursued a different line in an essay entitled 'Die Anfänge des Glaubensbekenntnisses,' in the *Festgabe für A. von Harnack* <sup>2</sup> in 1921, and followed this up by a series of brilliant notes called 'Symbolstudien' in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xxi (1921), and xxiii (1923). Here, in addition to many other details of interest and importance, he emphasizes four facts: (1) The differences between the earliest Roman (R) and Oriental (O) Symbols; (2) the essential agreement not only of Irenaeus but also of Tertullian with O rather than R; (3) the use of the separate *κήρυγμα* in the earliest form of the Mass; and (4) the evidence of Justin for the use of the *κήρυγμα* in exorcism. He dissents from Haussleiter as to the part played by Zephyrinus and Callistus, but in so doing seems to me to underrate the evidence of the "Little Labyrinth" as much as Haussleiter overpresses its meaning.

The statement of the Little Labyrinth (which is almost certainly a work of Hippolytus), found in Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 28, is as follows:

φασὶν γὰρ τοὺς μὲν προτέρους ἅπαντας καὶ αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀποστόλους παρειληφέναι τε καὶ διδασκάναι ταῦτα ἃ νῦν οὗτοι λέγουσιν, καὶ τετηρηῆσθαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ κηρύγματος μέχρι τῶν Βίκτορος χρόνων, ὃς ἦν τρισκαίδέκατος ἀπὸ Πέτρου ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπίσκοπος· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ διαδόχου αὐτοῦ Ζεφυρίνου παρακεχαράχθαι τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ἦν δ' ἂν τυχὸν πιθανὸν τὸ λεγόμενον, εἰ μὴ πρῶτον μὲν ἀντίπιδνον αὐτοῖς αἱ θεῖαι γραφαί· καὶ ἀδελφῶν δὲ τινῶν ἔστιν γράμματα, περὶ βύτερα τῶν Βίκτορος χρόνων, ἃ ἐκεῖνοι καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ πρὸς τὰς τότε αἵρέσεις ἔγραψαν, λέγω δὲ Ἰουστίνου καὶ Μιλτιάδου καὶ Τατιανοῦ καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ ἐτέρων πλείονων, ἐν οἷς

For they say that all who went before and the apostles themselves received and taught what they now say, and that the truth of the preaching was preserved until the times of Victor, who was the thirteenth bishop in Rome after Peter, but that the truth had been corrupted from the time of his successor Zephyrinus. What they said might perhaps be plausible if in the first place the divine Scriptures were not opposed to them; and there are also writings of certain Christians, older than the time of Victor, which they wrote to the Gentiles on behalf of the truth and against the heresies of their own time. I mean the works of Justin and Miltiades and Tatian and Clement

<sup>2</sup> Also published separately.

ἅπασιν θεολογείται ὁ Χριστός. τὰ γὰρ Εἰρηναίου τε καὶ Μελίτωνος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν τίς ἀγνοεῖ βιβλία, θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον καταγγέλλοντα τὸν Χριστόν, ψαλμοὶ δὲ ὅσοι καὶ ὧδαι ἀδελφῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ πιστῶν γραφείσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν Χριστόν ὑμνοῦσιν θεολογούντες; πῶς οὖν ἐκ τοσοῦτων ἐτῶν καταγγελλομένου τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ φρονήματος, ἐνδέχεται τοὺς μέχρι Βίκτορος οὕτως ὡς οὗτοι λέγουσιν κεκηρυχέναι; πῶς δὲ οὐκ αἰδοῦνται ταῦτα Βίκτορος καταψεύδεται, ἀκριβῶς εἰδότες ὅτι Βίκτωρ Θεόδοτον τὸν σκυτέα, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν καὶ πατέρα ταύτης τῆς ἀρνησιθεοῦ ἀποστασίας, ἀπεκήρυξεν τῆς κοινωρίας, πρῶτον εἰπόντα ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν Χριστόν; εἰ γὰρ Βίκτωρ κατ' αὐτοὺς οὕτως ἐφρόνει ὡς ἡ τούτων διδάσκει βλασφημία, πῶς ἂν ἀπέβαλεν Θεόδοτον τὸν τῆς αἵρέσεως ταύτης εὐρετήν;

and many others, in all of which Christ is treated as God. For who is ignorant of the books of Irenaeus and Melito and the others who announce Christ as God and man? And all the psalms and hymns which were written by faithful Christians from the beginning sing of the Christ as the Logos of God and treat him as God. How then is it possible that after the mind of the church had been announced for so many years those before Victor can have preached as these say? Why are they not ashamed of so calumniating Victor, when they know quite well that Victor excommunicated Theodotus the cobbler, the founder and father of this insurrection which denies God, when he first said that Christ was a mere man? For if Victor was so minded towards them as their blasphemy teaches, how could he have thrown out Theodotus who invented this heresy?

To this must be added the statement in Hippolytus, *Refutatio*, vii, 35:

Θεόδοτος δὲ τις ὢν Βυζάντιος εἰσήγαγεν αἵρεσιν καινὴν, φάσκων τὰ περὶ μὲν τῆς τοῦ παντὸς ἀρχῆς σύμφωνα ἐκ μέρους τοῖς τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἐκκλησίας, ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πάντα ὁμολογῶν γεγενῆσθαι, τὸν δὲ Χριστόν ἐκ τῆς τῶν γνωστικῶν καὶ Κηρίνου καὶ Ἐβίωνος σχολῆς ἀποσπάσας φάσκει τοιοῦτῳ τινὶ τρόπῳ πεφηνέναι. [καὶ] τὸν μὲν Ἰησοῦν εἶναι ἄνθρωπον ἐκ παρθένου γεγεννημένον κατὰ βουλὴν τοῦ πατρὸς, βιώσαντα δὲ κοινῶς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις καὶ εὐσεβέστατον γεγονότα ὕστερον ἐπὶ τοῦ βαπτισματος ἐπὶ τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ κεχωρηκέναι τὸν Χριστὸν ἄνωθεν κατεληλυθότα ἐν εἰδῇ περιστερᾶς, ὅθεν οὐ πρότερον τὰς δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ ἐνηργηκέναι ἢ ὅτε κατελθὼν ἀνεδέιχθη ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα, ὃ εἶναι τὸν Χριστόν προσαγορεύει.

Now a certain Theodotus, a Byzantine, introduced a new heresy. His statements concerning the rule of the universe were partially consistent with those of the true church, for he confessed that everything has been made by God, but the appearance of Christ he explained in some such way as this, making selections from the school of the Gnostics and Cerinthus and Ebion:—that Jesus had been born as a man from a Virgin according to the will of the Father, and had lived the life common to all men, and, having been very pious, had later on received the Christ at the baptism in the Jordan, who came down from above in the form of a dove. Whence miracles were not wrought by him before the Spirit,

θεὸν δὲ οὐδέποτε τοῦτον γεγονέναι  
αὐτὸν θέλουσιν ἐπὶ τῇ καθόδῳ τοῦ  
πνεύματος, ἕτεροι δὲ μετὰ τὴν ἐκ  
νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν.

which had come down, was manifested in him, and it is to the Spirit that he gives the name of the Christ. But that Jesus became God at the descent of the Spirit they never admit, though others say that he did so after the Resurrection from the dead.

It is quite true, as Lietzmann points out, that Haussleiter seems to take *τὴν ἀλήθειαν* and *τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ κηρύγματος* as though these phrases meant the *κήρυγμα* in the narrower sense. But I doubt whether Haussleiter quite means this, and I do not think that Lietzmann fully answers his real case. It seems to me probable that views had been introduced into the teaching of the church which the Theodotians claimed to be a perversion of the old Roman faith, this being that Jesus was a man into whom the Spirit had come and who was promoted to be the divine Lord either at the Baptism or at the Resurrection. It is quite likely that this really was the teaching of one section of the church in Rome, and also (though less certainly) at Antioch, for it is found in the Shepherd of Hermas, in which the Spirit is the son of God (or Christ) as Theodotus said. It is also, I think, the doctrine implied by the Gospel of Peter, which, whatever its origin, was used in the neighborhood of Antioch. There is nothing improbable in the view that Ignatius does not represent the whole of Antiochian thought, and that Paul of Samosata may be a survival of the non-Ignatian party, which Serapion did not suppress as completely as he thought.

The question naturally presents itself, how could the Adoptionist party — the Dynamic Monarchians of the third century and the friends of Hermas in the second — have maintained their position in Rome even before the time of Victor, for the successors of Justin Martyr must have been opposed to them?

Probably they were first in the field. It was Justin and the Logos-christology who were the newcomers, not the Adoptionists, and the Greek-Roman Christianity of the line Justin-Hippolytus is not the original Greek, which was, rather, the line Hermas-Artemon. The Logos-christology did not conquer until after the Latin element, originally African, had taken the lead.



It should also always be remembered that if the Canon of Muratori be, as seems probable, a Roman work of the beginning of the third century or end of the second, its derogation of the Shepherd of Hermas may be directed against the Adoptionist Christians.

If the facts as to the "Egyptian Church Order" were quite as Haussleiter states them, that work would be the natural starting point of further investigation. For as he quotes it, it clearly represents a creed in which the *κήρυγμα* comes after the trinitarian formula. Unfortunately the question is complicated by a textual problem.

Funk has translated the Coptic text of the Egyptian Church Order as follows:

Diaconus autem cum eo in aquam intret atque iubeat eum adiuvans dicere: "Credo in Deum unum verum, patrem omnipotentem, et in filium eius unigenitum Iesum Christum, dominum et salvatorem nostrum, et in spiritum eius sanctum omnia vivificantem, trinitatem consubstantialiem, deitatem unam, potestatem unam, regnum unum, fidem unam, baptismum unum, in sancta ecclesia catholica apostolica, in vitam aeternam, amen." Qui baptismum accipit, secundum haec omnia dicat: "Ita credo." Et baptismum perficiens manum suam in capite accipientis ponat eumque ter immergat, haec semper confitens. Tumque pergat dicens: "Credisne in dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, filium unicum Dei patris, quod mirabiliter propter nos homo factus est in unitate incomprehensibili per spiritum suum sanctum ex Maria sancta virgine sine semine virili, quodque crucifixus est pro nobis sub Pontio Pilato, mortuus est secundum suam voluntatem pro nostra salute simul, resurrexit tertia die, liberavit vinctos, ascendit in caelos, sedet ad dexteram patris sui boni in excelsis, et iterum venit iudicare vivos et mortuos secundum revelationem suam et regnum suum? Et credis in spiritum sanctum bonum ac vivificantem, qui omnia purificat, in sancta ecclesia?" Iterum dicat: "Credo." Deinde ex aqua exeant, et presbyter eum ungit oleo gratiarum actionis dicens: "Ungo te oleo sancto in nomine Iesu Christi." Eodem modo reliquos singulos ungit ac vestit, et in ecclesiam intrent.

On this text, or one similar to it, Haussleiter based his conclusions, admitting, of course, that such phrases as *trinitatem consubstantialiem* must be later additions, but otherwise accepting it. It is, however, questionable whether the whole passage is not a substitution for a different and more original text. In general the safe rule in dealing with the Egyptian Church Order is to begin with the Verona Palimpsest, if it be extant.<sup>3</sup> Here

<sup>3</sup> The authorities for the text are the Verona Latin, the Ethiopic version, and the Sahidic version. There are also secondary versions in Bohairic and Arabic. See

unfortunately it is only partly preserved, but it seems to point to a text not only earlier in detail but quite different. The part remaining is as follows:

manum habens in caput eius inpositam baptizet semel. Et postea dicat: "Credis in Christum Iesum, filium Dei, qui natus est de spiritu sancto ex Maria virgine et crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et mortuus est et sepultus et resurrexit die tertia vivus a mortuis et ascendit in caelis et sedit ad dexteram patris venturus iudicare vivos et mortuos?" Et cum ille dixerit: "Credo," iterum baptizetur. Et iterum dicat: "Credis in spiritu sancto et sanctam ecclesiam et carnis resurrectionem?" Dicat ergo, qui baptizatur: "Credo." Et sic tertia vice baptizetur. Et postea cum ascenderit, ungueatur a praesbytero de illo oleo, quod sanctificatum est, dicente: "Ungueo te oleo sancto in nomine Iesu Christi." Et ita singuli detergentes se iam induantur et postea in ecclesia ingrediantur. Episcopus vero manum iis inponens invocet dicens: "Domine Deus, qui dignos fecisti eos remissionem mereri peccatorum per lavacrum regenerationis spiritus sancti, immitte in eos tuam gratiam, ut tibi serviant secundum voluntatem tuam; quoniam tibi est gloria, patri et spiritu sancto, in sancta ecclesia et nunc et in saecula saeculorum. Amen." Postea oleum sanctificatum infundens de manu et inponens in capite dicat: "Ungueo te sancto oleo in domino patre omnipotente et Christo Iesu et spiritu sancto." Et consignans in frontem offerat osculum et dicat: "Dominus tecum." Et ille, qui signatus est, dicat: "Et cum spiritu tuo." Ita singulis faciat.

The question is, what has happened to the text? There are two possibilities. The original text of the Egyptian Church Order has been shown by Schwartz and Connolly<sup>4</sup> to be the "Apostolic Tradition" of Hippolytus, of which the Greek original is lost. Is the Hippolytean creed, as given by him in that book, to be found in the Latin or in the Coptic translation? Generally the Latin is the better authority. If it be so here, Hippolytus used the Roman combination, which inserted the *κήρυγμα* into the trinitarian formula. In that case the text quoted by Haussleiter is no evidence for his theory, but merely suggests that in Egypt a different custom prevailed, and that the Coptic translator replaced Hippolytus's baptismal custom by his own. The alternative is that the Coptic, though emended in places and generally admitted to be inferior, has here preserved the original text, and that the Verona fragment has been

Hauler, *Didascalie apostolorum fragmenta Veronensia latina*, and G. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles*.

<sup>4</sup> See E. Schwartz, *Ueber die pseudapostolische Kirchenordnungen*, and R. H. Connolly, *The So-called Egyptian Church Order* (Texts and Studies viii, 4).

changed by the insertion of the Roman custom. The matter is open to discussion, but as a general rule I should be slow to prefer the Coptic version to the Verona fragment.

If the Verona fragment be the original, it does not wholly impugn Haussleiter's theory, for Hippolytus may have accepted a modification of the baptismal formula introduced by Zephyrinus; but it is no longer possible to quote the Egyptian Church Order (that is, Hippolytus) for the position of the *κήρυγμα* at the end of the creed instead of in the middle.

A clearer starting-point ought to be sought, and is to be found in Irenaeus. The famous creed of Irenaeus is found in his *Adversus Haereses*, i. 10, 1 (Harvey, pp. 90 ff.), of which the Greek can be restored from Epiphanius as follows:

ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐκκλησία, καίπερ καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἕως περάτων τῆς γῆς διεσπαρμένη, παρὰ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν ἐκείνων μαθητῶν παραλαβοῦσα τὴν εἰς ἓνα θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, τὸν πεποιηκότα τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, πίστιν· καὶ εἰς ἓνα Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν σαρκωθέντα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας· καὶ εἰς πνεῦμα ἅγιον, τὸ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν κεκηρυχὸς τὰς οἰκονομίας, καὶ τὰς ἐλεύσεις, καὶ τὴν ἐκ παρθένου γέννησιν, καὶ τὸ πάθος, καὶ τὴν ἔγερσιν ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ τὴν ἑνσαρκον εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν τοῦ ἡγαπημένου Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἀναστήσαι πᾶσαν σάρκα πάσης ἀνθρωπότητος.

Here the position of the *κήρυγμα* is quite clear, as well as the fact, often overlooked, that it was so called because it was preached not merely by the Apostles, but by the Holy Spirit through the prophets. The guarantee of the Christian facts is the Old Testament. But, once more, questions arise, and perhaps it will always remain uncertain how far Irenaeus was quoting a document.

Still, assuming the probability of underlying documents, it appears that Irenaeus represents the 'postponed *κήρυγμα*,' while Tertullian is the almost contemporary witness for the 'inserted *κήρυγμα*.'

The evidence of Tertullian is given most clearly in his *De virginibus velandis* 1:

Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum deum omnipotentem, mundi conditorem, et

filium eius Iesum Christum, natum ex virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in caelis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram patris, venturum iudicare vivos et mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem.

The absence of the third clause, about the Holy Spirit, is remarkable, and the question of the exact form of the African creed is unsettled, but two points are clear: (1) the Latin is not identical with R; (2) the *κήρυγμα* is put in the same place as in R and not as in Irenaeus.

Thus the 'inserted *κήρυγμα*' is not the invention of Rome. But it does seem to have Latin rather than Greek affiliations, and possibly to be originally African.

Turning to historical considerations, it is tolerably clear that the final break in Rome between the Adoptionist party and the upholders of the Logos-theology is connected with the accession to power of Latin rather than Greek Christians. In other words, it began with Victor, who was an African, though it may not have been complete until the time of Zephyrinus. If the Verona fragment be the text of Hippolytus, the inserted *κήρυγμα* may still be the work of Zephyrinus, but it may be earlier. The facts would be covered by the theory that at the time of this break the Roman church accepted the 'inserted *κήρυγμα*,' in agreement with Tertullian and Africa rather than with Irenaeus and Gaul.<sup>5</sup> But it thoroughly revised the language. The parallel afforded by the African and European Latin versions of the Bible is obvious, and will not escape the textual critic. Moreover, though the statements about the Theodotiani in Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 28, are very obscure, they seem to indicate that textual criticism was drawn into the service of the theological controversy.

To turn to a slightly different point, I doubt whether Haussleiter is right in thinking that the *κήρυγμα* was a baptismal formula used for Jewish converts; but I believe that he was on the right lines in thinking of baptism. One of the most cer-

<sup>5</sup> Of course if the Coptic version of the Egyptian Church Order be right, Hippolytus would appear in his proper place, with Irenaeus rather than Tertullian. I should like to believe this, but conscience rebels at accepting a generally inferior text in the interests of a theory.



tain and at the same time puzzling facts is that in the early church there were two formulas. One is represented by the canonical text of Mt. xxviii. 19, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," the other in the Acts of the Apostles, "In the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts ii. 38, viii. 16, x. 48, xix. 5). Ultimately the former triumphed everywhere, but the latter is perhaps implied by the Shepherd of Hermas, and that it was once found in copies of Matthew known to Eusebius (were they of Antiochian provenance?) still seems to me the most probable conclusion from the evidence first pointed out by F. C. Conybeare, whose death has taken from all of us the service of so brilliant a mind, so gifted in winning new light from old facts, and from me a dear friend and teacher.

My guess would be that the custom of baptism "in the name of the Lord Jesus" lasted longer than we think, and that the *κήρυγμα* was an expansion of it, just as the symbol of Der-Balyzeh is an expansion of Mt. xxviii. 19. In this case, R is a conflation of two expansions of the two formulae for baptism current in the early church.

It would be tempting to suggest that baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus was preserved by the Adoptionist party in Rome, but I doubt whether this was the case, for the struggle in the early church was between Adoptionism and a Logos-christology, not between a trinitarian and non-trinitarian formula. And I suspect that both baptismal formulae are earlier than the introduction of a Logos-christology, or than the struggle between it and Adoptionism. The decisive point in that struggle was not the adoption of the trinitarian baptismal formula, expanded or unexpanded, but it may have been the insertion of the *κήρυγμα*—the expansion of the other formula—in such a way as to make it unacceptable to Adoptionists, and the final triumph was forcing the position that Son must mean Logos.

The trinitarian formula has now become a touchstone of orthodoxy; but so long as it did not mention the Logos and connect Jesus with the Logos rather than with the Spirit, it was acceptable enough to an Adoptionist. The Son — *teste* Marcellus

of Ancyra — was an ambiguous phrase even in the fourth century. The Adoptionists had a trinity, just as much as Hippolytus, but by the Son they meant Jesus after his apotheosis,<sup>6</sup> not the Logos, and one of the curious results of studying this obscure corner of Church history is to emphasize the fact that neither the Baptismal Formula, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," nor the rival formula, "In the name of the Lord Jesus," presupposes the development of the Logos-christology, but that they antedate it and — strange as it may seem — rather suit the Adoptionist view. The triple formula as it stands is quite intelligible with the Adoptionist meaning of Son, but it is well known that though Justin Martyr uses the formula in his theology, it is very hard to see what difference he makes between the Logos and the Spirit. As a rule he confuses them, and it seems as though, had he not known the formula, he would have had merely a Father and a Logos-Spirit; Tertullian's theology presents a similar though not identical problem.

All these investigations point to a broadening of method since the older studies of the Creed. The method of the earlier investigators was to search in the writers of the Christian church for phrases which might be quotations from the Apostles' Creed, and to draw thence proof of acquaintance with that document. The possibility was often neglected that the quotations might agree in substance, and even in word, with the Creed and yet come from a document, or even from several documents, which arranged the material differently. Let it be said, however, that it was not possible for the work to be done otherwise. Results can only be obtained by assuming a simple working hypothesis, which can be corrected after the results have been obtained, but not before, and — such are the limitations of the human mind — very rarely by the same person. We can all now stand on the shoulders of Hahn, Kattenbusch, Caspari, and Zahn, and see some details which they overlooked — but "there were giants in those days."

<sup>6</sup> I am delighted to see that Dean Inge in his 'Confessio Fidei' recognizes that the Synoptic Gospels represent an "apotheosis christology." See *Outspoken Essays*, II, p. 41.



## NOTES

### VARIA ARMENIA

#### I. ANANIAH THE TRANSLATOR ON JOHN THE BAPTIST

The following extract is from a homily attributed to a certain Ananiah, who was born about 380, and died about 450, or even later. He was ordained about the year 420 bishop of Sinni, a province of Great Armenia, and was associated with Mesrop and Sahak Catholicos in the great Christian revival which took place at the beginning of the fifth century. Father Basil (Dr. Sargisean) in 1899 edited this homily at Venice along with another, also attributed to him, upon Jonah. The latter contains passages taken from a tract on Jonah which is read among the Armenian paralipomena of Philo. It has for this reason been surmised that Ananiah was the translator of Philo, and of Irenaeus as well, for I have shown elsewhere that the Armenian versions of Philo and Irenaeus are from one and the same hand. The homily ends thus:

Moreover, John went down into hell as forerunner of the Word, just as Elia ascended into heaven as herald of the tidings to the celestials. For as Elia was a type of John, so John in turn became a type of Elia; for they two make known to us, one the grace of the other. For as this one was herald of the first coming of the Saviour, so that one shall be of the last dread coming. As the one snatched sinners and publicans from the violence of the evil one and led them to Christ, sanctifying them in the waters, so the other in the last times shall snatch the just from the hands of the Son of Perdition, the adversary of Christ, and present them to God by valorous championship. Moreover John, the first of humble ones, being herald of his coming, was so much exalted as was Elia, who is to come a herald of his first dread coming, and shall be still more a wonder-working force; for he doth not wage war on Herod, but he combats the originally evil serpent. For John went down into hell to inspire with joy those therein confined, because the womb of Sarah and Elizabeth, being bound, was type of hell. For none was able to loose the throes of the bonds of their wombs, until he came who was loosener of the bound ones (prisoners); and he by a word of authority loosed the throes of Sarah. But Elizabeth, who had in her womb John, was a type of hell that was pregnant in his bound womb with choirs of prophets and of all the righteous. And as Mariam's voice, like a herald of the Word, with whom she was pregnant in her bosom, resounded in the ears of Elizabeth, and the child silently leapt with joy over against the Virgin's child; so the voice of John as herald in front of the Word resounded in hell, and the silent spirits bound in the womb of hell leapt with joy to meet their liberator. And it was im-



possible for anyone to loose the throes of death and hell, until there came entered the womb of hell he who is lord of hell, and by his authoritative command loosed the power of death. And moreover in the sinlessness of the human body he went down into hell, nor had death authority to reign over him, for his righteousness was as mountains and his just decrees like many deeps. And such might as his the might of hell was not able to withstand, but it was riven asunder like the great serpent in the case of Daniel; and he released all those begulfed through him who was first-born of the dead; and in his train shall many brethren be born again from hell. And he was first-fruit of them that slept, that by such pure first-fruits might be purified those spirits from the defilement of hell, and become an offering to the Father and a fragrant odor. And having thus loosed the throes of death and taken prisoner the imprisoning one, he was raised up on high, according to the prophecy of David, that he may fulfil all and be made first in all.

I do not remember to have met with the idea elaborated in the above that John the Baptist went down into hell to fulfil there the same rôle that he had fulfilled on earth of forerunner or herald of the Lord.

The gospel citations in Ananiah's two homilies appear to be taken from an Armenian diatessaron. Thus John 1, 18 is quoted: 'quia deum nemo vidit, sed (or nisi) ó unigenitus qui in sinu patris, ille enarravit nobis.' Here the Armenian vulgate omits 'nobis,' and after 'unigenitus' adds 'filius.' On the other hand Ephrem's commentary on Tatian, 3, like Ananiah, omits 'filius' and adds 'nobis.' Aphrahat in the Armenian version 212, and also his Syriac text, equally omit 'filius.'

Matt. 3, 16, Ananiah writes:

The people stood at a distance, not only heard, but also saw, the word of God; for the word was transformed into the form of fire; first to the eyes it became visible as a flame, and then to ears it became audible, as Philo says: For the words of God are not unsubstantial, but things visible.

The Armenian diatessaron contained the addition of the Bobbio Codex that at the baptism a light shone from the waters. The Armenian text exactly reproduces the Old Latin: 'et cum baptizaretur Jesus, lumen magnum fulgebat de aqua.'

Mark 1, 7; Matt. 3, 11; John 1, 27: 'non sum ego Christus, sed qui post me venit, cui non sum idoneus solvere parvulam partem economici ejusdem mysterii: quia is est qui purificat vos spiritu et igne.'

The above is partly interpretation, but Ananiah had before him a conflation of the gospels of some kind. Matt. 11, 19: 'et justificatum est iudicium super filiis inobedientiae.' This points to the reading

τέκνων instead of ἔργων, but otherwise I know of no parallel. Arm. vulg. has τέκνων. Ananiah presents it as a formal citation; but his two homilies do not give me the impression that he cared to be accurate in his citations.

## II. PERSIAN NESTORIANISM

In the Letterbook of the Patriarchs, printed in Tiflis, 1901, from an ancient codex preserved in Constantinople, we read (p. 41) an encyclical letter addressed in the 18th year of Kavat king of kings, to the orthodox Persians. It appears that a deputation had arrived, no doubt of Armenians living in Persia, at Dwin in Ararat, the Armenian metropolis in that age, to consult Babgên the Catholicos on matters of faith. The deputies held the Nicene creed, and brought a copy of it with them, but they reported that in the 27th year of King Peroz their coreligionists in Tesbon (Ktesiphon), in Garmikan, in the Vehartashir province, and in other places began to be troubled by false teaching. The teaching was that of Acacius and Bardsuma and Uani and Yohanan and Paulé and Mikha and others, who held the tenets of Nestor and Diodorus. The orthodox brethren whom the deputies represented had appealed to the Persian king, who, it seems, had not interfered to save them from persecution.

Babgên announces in his letter, written at Dwin, the conclusion of a council he had there convoked. Like the Romans (*i.e.* Greeks), the three nations, he says, of Armenians, Virkh (Georgians) and Aghuankh (Albanians), were still loyal to the Nicene faith brought back to Armenia by their patriarch Aristaces; and he proceeds to give a summary of the tenets attributed to Babé, the Syrian Catholicos, by the deputies Samuel the Abbot and Shmavon the elder. This summary runs thus:

They say there are two Sons of God: one, God the Word equal with the Father, who descended from heaven; the other, Jesus, a man mortal like ourselves, who was born of Mary; and forasmuch as he became righteous above all men, he was honored and called Son of God, in name only and not Son of God, nor equal with the Father. But he was man, created mortal like ourselves. And since the Holy Spirit assisted him, he was able to overcome Satan and desires; and because of his righteousness and because of good works he became worthy of grace, to become a temple of God the Word. And they say it is meet to divide and say openly 'God perfect and man perfect': that is, God perfect took on man perfect, Jesus Christ; and because he loved him, he made him worthy to be honored after (*or* with) his own worship; and so was honored the man who received grace into himself. And the signs and wonders which he wrought [he wrought] by the Word of God, which came down from heaven and dwelled in him, that is in Jesus; and the wonders he

worked were empowered in him, and he had in himself all pains and humility, and was found mortal like ourselves, being of a human race equal with himself, by the word of God, Son of God. And they say it was not because of Jesus there came the voice from heaven in Jordan, 'He is my son beloved in whom I am well pleased'; but it came down to the Word of God, who is equal with the Father, who came down from heaven and dwelled in him. And they say, when through the shut doors he entered to the disciples, the doors were not shut, but the disciples from fear of the Jews had left the doors open. And the sectaries say that Jesus Christ was man mortal, created equal with us and not descended from heaven, neither went he up to heaven; but as Elia and Enoch were raised up into the air and have not yet seen God, nor shall see him until there is the resurrection. This the Nestorians say against us with the support of the books of Diodore and Theodore and Nestor and Theodoret and Habay. It is the rule (*or canon*) which was laid down by Acacius and Bardsuma and Mani and Pauli and their other associates. And thus, they say, do Romans and Armenians and Virkh and Aghuankh possess the same rule (*or canon*) of faith as we possess.

The above letter was written in Armenian and Persian, and sealed with the patriarch's ring. It reveals considerable differences among the Armenians living in Persia, and from other sources we know that similar opinions were widely diffused in Armenia, where they were identified with those of Chalcedon. They were really those advanced by the bishop Archelaus in his discussion with Mani, and Archelaus also regarded them as the normal orthodoxy of the Catholic Church. When the Armenians had to justify against the Roman and Byzantine churches their old custom of feasting Christmas and the Baptism both together on January 6, they easily fell into arguments similar to those here ascribed to Nestorians. Thus in the same Letterbook, in a defence of the double feast, John the Catholicos writes (p. 86) that the reason of it was that the two births of the Lord fell together, the one birth being in the flesh of the holy Virgin and the other through baptism in the Jordan by the spiritual font. In the one he took flesh from the nature of men; in the other the voice of the Father from heaven did not distinguish or separate his humanity, but named the godhood united in the flesh with the humanity as his beloved Son, saying 'in whom I am well pleased.' In the sequel John reveals that in his text stood the words, 'I this day have begotten thee.'

### III. JOHN XVII, 23-24

Early in the fifth century the Syrian Father Marutha composed a book of the Acts of Persian Mártirs of the period 350-400. He took his citations from a Syriac diatessaron, as his Armenian translator, Abraham the Confessor, did from an Armenian one. The Armenian

version was made in Persia about 460, and parts of it were critically edited in 1921 at Valarshapat by Galust Ter Mkrtchean. In the Armenian Text John 1, 23-24 is cited thus:

'dilexi eos sicut tu, pater, dilexisti me, et quodcunque dedisti mihi dedi illis, et volo ut ubi sim ego et illi sint.'

The words 'dedi illis' (δέδωκα αὐτοῖς) are not read in any other source, but they explain the reading δ δέδωκός μοι of  $\aleph^{BD}$  vg<sup>ms</sup> cop go. It might then be supposed that other codices had changed ὁ, which hangs in the air, into οὗς in the interests of sense and syntax. It seems much to suppose that the Armenian here could preserve words lost in every other source; but we must remember that Tatian, who lies behind the citations here, as in the rest of Marutha, may have used an early copy of the Fourth Gospel. Many of the other citations of the Armenian Marutha are very archaic. Tischendorf keeps ὁ and the English Revised Version renders it, though it makes nonsense. The words αὐτοῖς δέδωκα (or ἔδωκα) might have fallen out through homoeoteleuton in other texts, but the order δέδωκα αὐτοῖς is not so favorable to this hypothesis. It must be remembered, however, that the Armenian has come to us through a Syriac text, and in transit the original order of the Greek may have been changed, even by Tatian himself.

FREDERICK C. CONYBEARE.

## SOME OBSERVATIONS FAVORING THE PALESTINIAN ORIGIN OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

In the last year or two the Gospel of John has received unusual attention from English and American scholars, particularly with respect to its place of origin and language of composition. Several scholars, notably Burney,<sup>1</sup> Montgomery,<sup>2</sup> and Torrey<sup>3</sup> have independently reached the conclusion that the book was composed by an author who either spoke and thought Aramaic or actually composed his work in that tongue. Burney contends that the writer was born and raised in Palestine, where he knew Jesus in his youth, and that he later went to Antioch, where he composed the book in Aramaic, or at least in a Greek which constantly reflects his Aramaic thought. Montgomery supposes that the writer was a Jew who gained his life-

<sup>1</sup> The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, Oxford, 1922.

<sup>2</sup> The Origin of the Gospel according to St. John, Philadelphia, 1923.

<sup>3</sup> Harvard Theological Review, vol. XVI, 1923, pp. 305-344.



experience in Palestine during the first half of the first century, and who thought in Aramaic, though he leaves open the question as to whether he actually wrote in that language. According to Torrey, the book was written in Aramaic by a Palestinian author.

The problem is extraordinarily elusive, because John is so unique in its genre, peerless in its insight, and inextricably associated with the other books that bear the name 'John.' Nor can one rid himself of the feeling that it is hard, in a purely philological discussion, to do justice to the involved historical questions. It need hardly be said that I have no intention of entering into a debate on a subject which is extremely difficult even for specialists. An interested perusal of the recent literature has, however, left the impression that the Aramaic idioms are due to actual composition in Aramaic, as Torrey maintains, but that the writer himself put his work into Greek later, possibly in Ephesus, introducing the logos-preface at this time in order to create a point of contact with his new Greek audience. As Torrey has noted, the drastic mistranslations from Aramaic into Greek which Burney assumes are mostly unconvincing; a striking illustration will be given below. The inexact translations pointed out by Torrey himself are little points where the author himself might fail in his rendering without necessarily misunderstanding his own manuscript. From the historical point of view, one must find some explanation of the penetrating sympathy with Jesus' inner life and the exact knowledge of many Palestinian details, when compared with the occasional dimness of outline and obvious historical refraction which lead one to reject composition by an actual eye-witness. May not John the presbyter have been the son (or nephew) of John the beloved disciple and apostle? Such a solution would account for all the facts cited, as well as explain the modest intimacy of allusion to the disciple's relations with his master, incomprehensible in any but the disciple himself or an immediate relative possessed of a sensitive fineness of tact. It may be added that a son, born as late as between 30 and 40 A.D., might survive into Trajan's reign without living to an abnormally high age.

One of Burney's conjectured cases of mistranslation is John 7, 38, where he thinks that *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ρέουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος* is a mistranslation of an Aramaic original which is to be rendered as follows: ('He that thirsteth, let him come unto me; and let him drink) that believeth on me. As the Scripture hath said, Rivers shall flow forth from the fountain of living water.' This result is derived by assuming an original *ma'yan*,

'fountain,' which the translator is supposed to have misread as *me'in*, 'bowels.' The difficulty with the passage is only that the ancient oriental conception lying at the base of it is not known to New Testament scholars — or even to Old Testament scholars, whose fields naturally bring them but seldom into contact with the somewhat strange world of Syro-Mesopotamian thought and symbolism.

Both the Mesopotamians and the Egyptians believed that their respective two rivers, the Tigris and Euphrates on the one hand, and the two Niles on the other, sprang from a common source or mouth, which was represented symbolically either as the mouth of a sacred animal (serpent, bull, ibex, etc.) or as a spouting vase, held by a god or genius of fertility in the underworld.<sup>4</sup> The latter conception was the more popular of the two, and was represented times without number in Egyptian iconography and on Mesopotamian seals. The spouting vase is held by our genius to his breast. In a remarkable series of statues at the entrance of a palace in Dûr Šar-rukîn, discovered by Place, each statue represents such a genius of fertility, wearing the horned tiara (they were primarily conceived of in the form of bulls), and holding the spouting vase, from which four streams rise, to his bosom, with its base at his navel.<sup>5</sup> Similar genii are pictured on the seal-cylinders. The conception of four rivers, instead of two, rising from the common source is found also in both Egyptian and Mesopotamian sources, both literary and monumental; it originated in a symmetrical development, one river for each direction, each quarter of the earth (*kibrât arba'im*). In intimate association with it arose the idea that the four rivers arose at the centre, or navel, of the earth, a notion wide-spread in early oriental and Aegean mythology.<sup>6</sup>

We have, moreover, absolute proof that these Syro-Mesopotamian conceptions survived into Hellenistic times, and later. In Mandaean religion the spouting vase played an important rôle in the ritual, under the name *mambû'â*, equivalent, as Zimmern has shown, to Babylonian *namba'u*, 'fountain.'<sup>7</sup> This vase is naturally, as was fully recognized by the Gnostics themselves, the source of the *πηγή*

<sup>4</sup> Cf. American Journal of Semitic Languages (AJSL), vol. XXXV, pp. 161-195, especially pp. 173 ff.; vol. XXXIX, pp. 22 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. AJSL XXXIX, p. 29, n. 1, and Boissier, La situation du paradis terrestre, Geneva, 1916, pp. 18 f.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. AJSL XXXVI, pp. 261 ff.; XXXIX, pp. 28 f.

<sup>7</sup> Nöldeke Festschrift, pp. 959-967.

(or ποτήριον) ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον (cf. John 4, 14) which is so characteristic of Johannine and Gnostic mysticism. Furthermore, in the Peratic, *i.e.* Euphrataean, sect of Gnostics, we have the lineal offspring of the Euphrates worshippers from whom came the mosaic pavement described by Von Oppenheim, who found it at el-Mas'ūdiyeh on the middle Euphrates. In it the river-god Euphrates, with name attached both in Greek and in early Syriac characters (*prāt malkā*), holds the spouting vase.<sup>8</sup> Incidentally it may be observed that the amphora with the two streams spouting from its mouth has a long and complicated history in Hellenistic and Roman-Byzantine decoration, appearing in many original and derived forms, especially on mosaic pavements. The Peratics believed, according to Hippolytus, that the river Euphrates was the source of all life, spiritual as well as physical, and that it arose in the middle of the perfect man (*i.e.* both *protanthropos* and the individual mystic *τέλειος*) from great ocean (the old Babylonian *apsū*).<sup>9</sup> Though we have merely touched the fringe of a vast and important subject — the source of the Christian conception of baptism in ancient Syro-Mesopotamian symbolism — enough has been said to make the genuinely oriental character of John 7, 38 clear. To change the meaning of the text so completely as Burney has done is to spoil it; we must remember that *κοιλία* meant to the ancient not 'belly' in the vulgar modern sense, but 'seat of the liver and reins,' where the true source of being and thought was fancied to be — a popular conception which was but slowly dislodged. Jesus meant that the Holy Spirit, entering into the hearts of men, would make them a source of purity and truth to all around them. If understood, the symbolism is beautiful, though one may freely admit its unhellenic character — another proof of Burney's own thesis. Torrey's suggestion (pp. 339 f.) also becomes unnecessary, though it is not impossible that a reminiscence of Zech. 14, 8 was floating in John's mind, but in view of the numerous references to the apocalyptic literature certainly to be found in Peter, Jude, and the Apocalypse, another such reference can hardly be surprising; the canon had not yet been formed.

On the other hand, the Logos is most emphatically not an oriental conception. Moore has proved conclusively that the *memrā* is something quite distinct, which should no longer be compared to the Stoic and Philonic principle.<sup>10</sup> Nor can we accept the view of Langdon,

<sup>8</sup> Byzantinische Zeitschrift, vol. XIV, pp. 58 f.; AJSL XXXVI, p. 293.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. AJSL XXXVI, pp. 292 f.

<sup>10</sup> Harvard Theological Review, vol. XV, 1922, pp. 41-61.



Böhl, and others, that the *logos* is primarily a Mesopotamian conception, as the writer has tried to show in detail.<sup>11</sup> But the Hellenic origin of the *logos* does not affect the Aramaic origin of the Johannean theology in general, since the forced identification of Christ with the Stoic *logos* is clearly a secondary idea on the writer's part, having nothing to do with his basic conceptions.

In conclusion the writer would discuss briefly two topographical points which seem to have been neglected or misunderstood. The first is that of the location of Aenon and Salim, where John the Baptist is said to have been baptizing before he was cast into prison (John 3, 23). As is well known, ecclesiastical tradition, as reflected by Eusebius, Aetheria, and the map of Mâdebâ, placed these towns in the plain of Scythopolis, some eight miles south of Beisân, identifying Salim with Salumias, perhaps modern Tell er-Ridghah.<sup>12</sup> Another tradition, however, was known, as shown by a second entry in the map of Mâdebâ, placing Aenon considerably farther south, at the village then called Sapsaphas, the exact location of which is not known. Salumias is entirely unknown in other sources, and has so different a vocalization from Salim, that one cannot but feel the improbability of Eusebius's combination, upon which the later ecclesiastical tradition was based. It is, in fact, hard to understand why John should have come to the region of the heathen city of Scythopolis in order to baptize Jews, and harder to understand the comment, "because there was much water there," if he baptized so near the Jordan. Instead of remaining at a spring or springs only a mile from the Jordan, according to the patristic theory, he would naturally have baptized in the Jordan, just as he did farther south. The comment in question is obviously intended to explain why he chose a place so far removed from the Jordan as Aenon.

The only Salim (Σαλειμ) of which we know from other sources is the ancient town of the name, modern Sâlim, east of Nâblus. This town is referred to (Gen. 33, 18) as existing in the time of the patriarchs, again (Jer. 41, 5<sup>13</sup>) in the time of Jeremiah, later in Judith, and elsewhere. Eusebius does not mention it, a fact which explains sufficiently why he felt himself obliged to make the identification with

<sup>11</sup> Journal of Biblical Literature, vol. XXXIX, pp. 143-151 (cf. Journal of the Society of Oriental Research, vol. VII, p. 79).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Dalman, *Orte und Wege*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 189 f.

<sup>13</sup> Text of LXX, B. That 'Shiloh' of the Hebrew is erroneous is proved by other clear statements in Jeremiah to the effect that Shiloh was then in ruins, a datum sustained by Aage Schmidt's soundings on the site (cf. Bulletin of the American Schools, No. 9, pp. 10-11).



Salumias — Salim was unknown to him. Now Conder pointed out long ago<sup>14</sup> that Aenon near Salim must be modern 'Ainûn, with identically the same name, nearly eight miles northeast of Sâlim. It is true that the modern site has no water, but the name alone<sup>15</sup> shows that the ancient village of this name lay nearer the head of the Wâdî Far'ah, now three miles away, either at Hirbet es-Smeit, or at Tam-mûn. Wâdî Far'ah is a perennial stream, with fine springs at its source, and in ancient times pools where immersion could be conveniently practised. In fact, it is the nearest suitable place of baptism to Neapolis, the Samaritan centre. There can be little doubt that John preached to the Samaritans as well as to the Jews proper; otherwise it would be very hard to explain how his name came to be associated with that of the Samaritan Dositheus. Moreover, there is surely some nucleus of truth in the persistent tradition which places his burial-place at Sebaste (Samaria). Here, therefore, we have a clear case in which the Gospel of John is more accurate in its topographical documentation than Eusebius or the other patristic students of Palestinian topography.

John 11, 54 states that Jesus went to a place near the wilderness, called Ephraim, in order to spend the interval before the passover there with his disciples. It is generally believed that Ephraim is eṭ-Taïyibeh, a Christian village lying more than 2800 feet above sea-level, in a climate very inclement during the winter — not at all the kind of spot one would expect Jesus to select for the purpose. Nor is it "near the wilderness." The writer has elsewhere tried to show that Ephraim is clearly located both in the Old Testament, the Talmud, and church fathers, at Sâmieh, in the wide and beautiful valley of the same name, lying east of Tell 'Aşûr.<sup>16</sup> The place was important in the Canaanite and early Israelite times, to judge from the tombs and pottery alone, and survived, as shown by tombs, pottery, and inscriptions, into the late Byzantine period. Sâmieh is a secluded, almost inaccessible valley, really on the edge of the wilderness, since there are no more villages lying between it and the Jordan valley, and is only 1400 feet above sea-level, protected on all sides by lofty hills, and with an abundant water-supply. It thus fulfils all the conditions, and the identification may be regarded as virtually certain, since the only other claimant, Noaran, has been located defi-

<sup>14</sup> *Memoirs of the Survey of Western Palestine*, vol. II, p. 234.

<sup>15</sup> 'Ainûn goes back to a Hebrew \*'Ainôn, from 'ain, 'fountain.'

<sup>16</sup> *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, vol. III, pp. 36-40. The material will be given in greatly extended form in the *Annual of the American Schools*, vol. IV-V.

nately at 'Ain Dûq. Again we find that the writer of our gospel was possessed of singularly accurate information regarding the geography of Palestine, a fact which decidedly favors his Palestinian origin.

W. F. ALBRIGHT.

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH,  
JERUSALEM.

## ACTS AND THE ROMAN TRIAL OF PAUL

The apologetic purpose of the Book of Acts has been frequently remarked, but I am not aware that this has been brought into connection with the historical situation in Acts 28, 30. Yet the object of presenting a defense of Paul before the Roman courts bears a curious relation to the analysis of the sources of the book. We are chiefly concerned here with the second half of the work, Acts 16-28, setting aside the "we-sections." Notice the character of the narratives. First, there are the narratives which represent Paul as moving under the protection of Roman citizenship and of Roman officials, and his enemies as resorting to lawlessness:—Acts 16, 25-34; 19, 23-41; 21, 30-40; 23, 10-35; 25, 1-5; 6-12; 28, 30-31. Secondly, there are presented the legal precedents for Paul's case, in narratives of his acquittal in lesser Roman courts:—Acts 16, 35-40; 17, 5-9; 18, 12-17; 22, 22-29; 24, 1-9; 22-23; 25, 13-27; 26, 30-32. Thirdly, the speeches recorded constitute a plea in Paul's defense:—Acts 17, 16-33, a defense of his message for the pagan mind; Acts 22, 1-21, a defense of his faithfulness to the Jewish God; Acts 24, 10-21, his fidelity to Jewish institutions; Acts 26, 1-23, his loyalty to the Jewish faith. Three of these speeches deal with the apostle's relations with Judaism, which also constitute the next topic. Fourthly, Paul is defended against the charge of participation in a *religio illicita* by the consistent representation of Christianity as a Jewish sect or party. Paul begins his work in the synagogues, meets frequent approbation among the Jews, and his enemies are represented as engaged in the partisan conflict in which the Roman government can take no interest: Acts 16, 1-3; 17, 11-13; 18, 2-8; 18-22; 18, 24-19, 8; 22, 30-23, 9; 28, 17-28.

These portions constitute five-sixths of the material in these sections. The remainder is divided between four narratives less distinctly apologetic (16, 19-24; 19, 9-20; 21, 27-29; 26, 24-29), and



the necessary transitions and travel-summaries (16, 4-8; 17, 1-4; 10; 14-15; 34; 18, 1; 9-11; 23; 19, 21-22; 20, 1-4). The large, almost exclusive, apologetic interest in these sections seems significant.

In the "we-sections," on the other hand, this apologetic is confined to a very few references — the kindness of the centurion Julius (27, 3; 43), Paul's Jewish connections at Philippi (16, 13), and his attempt to conciliate the hostile element at Jerusalem (21, 18-26, a section which does not have the 'we' within it). His speech to the Ephesian elders is rather a defense of his relations with the church, for the benefit of Christians.

This gives rise to the suggestion: were the narratives and reports discussed above originally composed as a brief for use in Paul's Roman trial? Such an hypothesis would explain the abrupt termination of Acts 28, 31 — the brief was of course brought down to date; though it may not explain why in the later compilation of the book of Acts the ending was *left* abrupt. It would also explain the abruptness of the transitions to the "we-sections," these being regarded as later interpolations *into* the brief. Lukan authorship of the brief, as of the "we-sections," would be rendered quite probable; and Luke might well have been responsible for the combination of the two, in preparing a version of the brief for more general circulation among Paul's friends. But why he should have left the abrupt conclusion will still remain a problem.

ALFRED M. PERRY.

SMITH COLLEGE.